

there is but four thousand millions, substantially, of silver in the world, he wants me to correct him.

Mr. TELLER. I do not want to be corrected, because I think I stated it properly. That is the silver money of the world, and that is what these gentlemen are afraid of. I was diverted by what the Senator from New Hampshire said. I went to New York once, and I went through the great establishments that furnish silver, and there is not a kind of goods in what they call plain goods or flat goods that can come to the mint unless silver gets above 1.25. It would not come here except as it was worn out, and the older silver gets in the present day the more desirable it is for the people who have it to keep it and transmit it to their heirs.

We are dealing and we ought to deal only with the silver money. Seven hundred millions of it and more is limited tender. That is a low grade. England circulates one hundred and eleven millions at 14.28. She can not send it here. Germany's limited legal-tender money is all about the same. The best of them are at 15½, and none of them above it. You can not ship it here from one country in Europe and not lose from 4 to 5 cents.

Three cents and a fraction is the difference between our ratio here and theirs, and when you consider that much of the silver is worn, when you consider that they must lose interest and the cost of transportation, I say there is a difference of 5 per cent between theirs and ours. Why send it? Every dollar of it is doing money duty. France, with her great stock of silver, issues upon it paper and makes it do money duty; and I challenge any man to show me that the paper money of France, based upon silver and payable in silver or gold at the option of the bank, is worth any less than paper based on gold.

It has been shown before every commission that France has maintained absolutely the relation between her silver and gold at 15½ to 1. That is a bugbear which is put up to frighten somebody, and it either indicates a lack of sincerity and fairness or great ignorance on the part of those who contend for it here. I have tried to be rather temperate in debate, but I think when I am challenged and am told that my efforts here are to get this country on a silver basis, I have a right to speak as Senators speak their honest convictions, I have no doubt, as to myself.

Mr. President, take those countries. There is not one of them which can spare this money. You can not take \$50,000,000 of silver out of Europe without creating a panic. We could absorb it in a night, for we have sent thirty millions of gold in a month and forty-five millions of gold in a month to Europe, and we have got back from Europe sometimes half of it in a month or pretty nearly that—twenty-five or thirty million dollars a month. You can not take any money out of Europe to-day without creating a panic. All Europe is in distress for fear we are going to call for gold to settle the balances of trade between us and them.

I know how useless it is to present these facts. I have been here twenty years and more, and I have heard the same old things repeated over and over again. When I followed the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] in 1878, when he made the speech which I remember and which was read here by the Senator from Missouri, I recall that on this floor there were the same croakings, the same claim: "You can not circulate the two metals together, and you do not want to. You are after cheap money. That is what you are after."

Mr. President, I am for an honest money, and that is the money the contract calls for, whether it be gold or whether it be silver; and if the option is that the debtor may pay either, that is an honest money that he pays in. I deny that in the interest of so-called honesty the Government of the United States has a right to get rid of that great valuable privilege and give it to the bondholders, even if they are disposed to give now ninety-odd millions to them as a premium to refund their bonds not yet due.

Mr. President, I have heard a great many foolish things. I have heard a great many prophecies. I have seen this country absorbing and using ten times as much silver as the Secretary of the Treasury declared it was possible to circulate, and I have seen it circulating it without any pledge on the part of the Government that it would maintain the parity. No such pledge existed until 1893, and that had not the slightest influence upon the value of the silver dollar or the silver certificate.

The silver money of the country circulates at par because there is a necessity for it, because it is wanted, because it is needed, and any country, as was stated yesterday, that has a commerce and will keep her money within her commercial demands, may just as well circulate iron or copper or paper as to circulate gold. It is only a question whether she will have the courage and the wisdom to stop at the right point.

Every indication is that we have not yet reached a point where there could be any danger with silver; and if you open your mints, every dollar of it would be worth its face value as bullion, pounded up. It would stand the test in a fire, because it could be reconverted into money, and there is not a bit of bullion in the world that would not be, as the Senator from Missouri says, worth its

face value at our mints, less what it would cost to get it here. It would not come. It would be needed there; but when they wanted it for mintage in India or England or anywhere else, the holder would say, "I know a place where I can put it into money, where I can buy everything that a human being wants—luxuries and necessities of life and everything else. I know where it will discharge as much money duty as gold; and if you do not give me the price that I want for it, I will take it there." The man who holds any kind of commodity, with a known and a reachable market, makes the price of it. When a man knows the price in London for flour, he never sells it at New York at the bidder's wish. He sells it at the London price less the money that it requires him to get it there.

This metal is moved from one end of the world to the other absolutely on the same commercial basis as gold. I mean it costs no more to send a million dollars of silver from London to New York than it does to send a million of gold. That, I suppose, has been the rule for ages. It goes by value and not by weight; and this being the case, there is no reason for any man to stand here and say we will be flooded by silver unless he has concluded that the business of the world can be conducted better without the silver of the world than with it.

Will some one show me where there is a plethora of silver—where there is a superabundance of it—where the people are willing to get rid of it? Germany went to the gold basis in 1871, and she has got more than a hundred millions of full legal-tender silver that she can not get rid of. A few days since the Parliament of Germany determined to issue a large amount of subsidiary silver money because of the demands the agriculturists were making upon them to do so, and the statement was made there that the country was suffering for a lack of silver money.

Mr. COCKRELL. She has now one hundred and nineteen millions of limited legal-tender silver coin.

Mr. TELLER. Besides?

Mr. COCKRELL. Besides her eighty-eight millions of full legal tender.

Mr. TELLER. That makes somewhere over two hundred millions. As I said, Mr. President, England has one hundred and eleven millions circulating, so that if she were to send it here she would lose practically 10 per cent on it. Does anybody then think she is going to get rid of it? Will anybody take this table which the Director of the Mint has put here and show me a dollar that any nation wants to get rid of? You can not do it.

Mr. PETTUS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the question is put, I should like to give notice that I shall try to secure a vote upon the passage of the bill at as early an hour to-morrow as possible.

Mr. COCKRELL. Take it up after the morning business.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will ask to have it taken up after the morning business, and I will try to get a vote as soon as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama, that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 15, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 14, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ELECTION CONTEST—WISE VS. YOUNG.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the views of the minority in the contested-election case of Wise vs. Young. In doing this, I wish to state that the extension of time so kindly granted to me last week expired yesterday; but the House yesterday adjourned unexpectedly early, and this report was handed to the Clerk at 8 o'clock yesterday afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The views of the minority of the committee as just presented will be referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering appropriation bills.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment in order that I may submit a privileged report?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for that purpose.

ELECTION CONTEST—ALDRICH VS. ROBBINS.

Mr. MANN. I present from the Committee on Elections No. 1 a report in the contested-election case of Aldrich vs. Robbins, which I ask may be printed and referred to the Calendar. The

gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] wishes to present the views of a minority of the committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not distinctly hear what the gentleman from Illinois said; but, as I understand, he presents the report of a majority of the committee in the contested-election case of *Aldrich vs. Robbins* from the Fourth Congressional district of Alabama, a copy of which he has furnished to me.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to submit now the views of the minority?

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to submit now the views of the minority and to ask that they be printed with the report of the committee. In submitting these views, I beg to state that one of my colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Fox], was present at the time the case was heard and determined, but is now absent by reason of the serious illness of his wife. He has authorized me in writing to sign his name to the views of the minority, which I have done.

The SPEAKER. The report of the committee, together with the views of the minority, will be referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken on the motion which I now renew, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills, I trust we may reach some understanding as to the time at which general debate shall terminate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest that the general debate run for two days.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can not agree to that. In view of the fact that we shall have a week's discussion on the Puerto Rican bill, giving members ample opportunity to be heard, I think that the time for general debate on the legislative appropriation bill ought to be limited to, say, 4 o'clock to-day. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all general debate on the bill just named be closed at 4 o'clock to-day and that then the bill be taken up under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to consider general appropriation bills, he asks unanimous consent that general debate on the legislative appropriation bill be limited to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I can not consent to that.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Georgia. The question is, Will the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose stated?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will not the gentleman from Georgia consent that the general debate close at 5 o'clock this afternoon?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am willing that the general debate run until half past 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, and that then we take up the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can not consent to that.

Mr. CANNON. May I be allowed just a moment? We are all aware that on Friday the bill from the Ways and Means Committee is to be called up, on which general discussion will be allowed for a week or longer. Now, it is very desirable that this bill should pass before the expiration of the week. If we can close general debate to-day, we can pass the bill under the five-minute rule to-morrow.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to interpolate a remark or ask a question right there? I suppose that the committee in considering the revenue bill expects to have a debate of a week or more. Now, if we can get a statement that we would have, say, ten days of debate on that subject, I have no doubt that the gentleman from Georgia would agree to the proposition which the gentleman from Indiana now makes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas will suspend a moment. The Chair must again invite the House to come to order and to cease conversation. We are here to transact public business intelligently, and it can not be done unless the House is in order. All gentlemen will please cease conversation.

Mr. McRAE. You will appreciate the importance of this question when you understand that we have only six days in the week, and we get out of that but fourteen hours. There are fourteen members of the committee, and those who are not members of the committee will have no opportunity to discuss that measure. For that reason there is a desire to discuss it upon this bill. It would be more pertinent upon the other bill, and if we can get an arrangement which would allow discussion on the Philippine and Puerto Rico questions, it should be upon the other bill rather than this.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas that his arithmetic is a little off. Six days a week would give us thirty hours.

Mr. McRAE. Fourteen to a side. The gentleman from Tennessee informs me that there would be only fourteen; he meant fourteen on a side.

Mr. PAYNE. There are seventeen members of the committee. If they all desired to speak, why they would use half of that time.

Mr. McRAE. If we could get an understanding that there would be plenty of time for general debate on that measure, I have no doubt that the gentleman from Georgia would agree to the request that is now made by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why not have an agreement made now on the Puerto Rican bill, that we have after the completion of this bill and all the following week until Monday, and that the bill be then considered under the five-minute rule on the following Monday. I do not suppose it would take long to dispose of it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, so far as I am concerned—

Mr. RICHARDSON. That would give us two more days for general debate.

Mr. PAYNE. So far as I am concerned, I am willing that a vote be taken on the Puerto Rican bill a week from Monday next.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And it then be discussed under the five-minute rule?

Mr. PAYNE. But the final disposition of it be made on that day. I desire to have that done, because one of the members of the committee on this side expects to be away the following day on some peremptory business; and if we can have an agreement, we can have that arrangement made.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman agree that after the reading of the Journal on that day it be taken up for discussion under the five-minute rule? I presume it will not take more than an hour and a half, and there will probably be no amendments offered.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly; if the vote be taken on that day.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That will do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. With that understanding, I am willing.

Mr. CANNON. Let me submit to the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana again state his request?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman from Illinois wants to make a suggestion.

Mr. CANNON. To the gentleman from Georgia as well as the gentleman from Indiana. It seems to me we would get more debate about a thing not about this bill if we would pass this bill through in an orderly way, so that we can take the bill up at once and confine ourselves to this bill, and pass it, with the agreement that whatever is left of to-day or to-morrow should be devoted to general debate. It seems to me that would give more time for general debate.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How much does this bill carry?

Mr. CANNON. About \$25,000,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It ought to be discussed a day itself.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will agree that general debate run to-day and that we take the bill up for consideration under the five-minute rule to-morrow.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. PAYNE. If this bill should consume Friday, we do not want to take up the revenue bill on Saturday, but want to take it up on Monday of the following week.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We are willing to make that agreement with you.

Mr. PAYNE. I am perfectly willing to make an agreement to take up the revenue bill next week, with the understanding that the final vote be taken on that day week; that the committee rise and report the bill to the House on Monday week at 4 o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That would not give us sufficient time. If you will make it Wednesday of next week—

Mr. CANNON. The white-buttoned mandarins of the largest committee of the House had better let us pass our little appropriation bills and take such time as they see proper on important universal questions.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed on this bill to-day and that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal, it be taken up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. RICHARDSON. With the understanding, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that general debate on the legislative appropriation bill be closed with to-day's session and that after the approval of the Journal on to-morrow it be taken up under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is agreed to with the understanding that the revenue bill is to be taken up on Saturday and voted on a week from the Monday following.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better agree now that the revenue bill be taken up next Monday, and then we will agree to close it in some way at that time.

Mr. MAHON. I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. MAHON. I think we had better take up the administrative bill and pass that, and then consider the other when it comes up. Let us dispose of one at a time.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania objects to my request?

Mr. MAHON. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; we object to that unless we make the other arrangement. I mean the agreement as to debate on the Puerto Rico bill.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. SMITH of Illinois, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. GRIFFITH, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, indefinitely, on account of important business.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair, for the consideration of appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of an appropriation bill the title to which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 8347, making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally to receive a message from the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee rose informally; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. DALZELL, having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2356. An act extending the powers and functions of the Court of Private Land Claims to June 30, 1902;

S. 79. An act to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.;

S. R. 36. Joint resolution to carry into effect two resolutions of the Continental Congress, directing monuments to be erected to the memory of Gens. Francis Nash and William Lee Davidson, of North Carolina;

S. 1356. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Field;

S. 1631. An act to encourage enlistment in the United States Navy;

S. 1535. An act to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Navy and to regulate promotion therein;

S. 1632. An act to amend "An act authorizing certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths," approved January 25, 1895;

S. 2447. An act to place Lieut. Col. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army;

S. 726. An act for the relief of Alice Walsh;

S. 2334. An act to authorize Hon. Arthur S. Hardy, at present envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, to accept the decoration tendered to him by the Shah of Persia while he was minister of the United States to that country;

S. 2022. An act to authorize Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson, United States Navy; Capt. Henry C. Taylor, United States Navy; Capt. Francis A. Cook, United States Navy; Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, United States Navy; Capt. French E. Chadwick, United States Navy; Capt. Caspar F. Goodrich, United States Navy; Commander William W. Mead, United States Navy; Commander James H. Dayton, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Symonds, United States Navy, and Commander Chapman C. Todd, United States Navy, to accept orders and decorations tendered to them by the Government of Venezuela;

S. 630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harriet D. Newson;

S. R. 60. Joint resolution granting permission for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of Gen. Francis E. Spinner, late Treasurer of the United States;

S. 2681. An act for the establishment of a joint light-house and fog-signal station on the coast of Alaska;

S. 1289. An act to provide for the construction of an additional light-ship for use on the coast of California, Oregon, Washington, or Alaska, as exigencies may determine;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lindley C. Kent and Joseph Jenkins, as the sureties of Frank A. Webb;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Spottwood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased;

S. 945. An act for the purchase and construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.;

S. 2708. An act to amend an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899;

Senate concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made, and submit a report and an estimate for deepening and properly improving the channel through the outer bar in the Gulf of Mexico near the mouth of Mobile Bay.

S. 2840. An act for enlarging the public building at Portland, Oreg., situated between Morrison, Yamhill, Fifth, and Sixth streets, in said city;

S. 2366. An act to authorize the establishment at some point on Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, of a station for the investigation of problems connected with marine-fishery interests of the middle and south Atlantic coast;

S. 557. An act for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh;

S. 76. An act for the relief of the University of Kansas; and

S. 1749. An act for the payment to Joshua T. Roberts of balance due for surveying public lands.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7739. An act to amend an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5288. An act relating to lights on steam pilot vessels.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES A. CHICKERING, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the presiding officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

And that in compliance with the foregoing the presiding officer had appointed as said committee Mr. PLATT of New York, Mr. MASON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

CUSTOMS AND INTERNAL REVENUE IN THE ISLAND OF PUERTO RICO.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice, in view of the action which has been taken, that I shall call up the Puerto Rico bill on Monday next immediately after the reading of the Journal.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a short explanation of this bill. I call the attention of members of the committee to House Report No. 289. They will notice by this report that the estimates amount to \$25,000,000, and that the amount recommended by the committee is \$23,874,000, or \$1,147,000 less than the estimate.

Mr. Chairman, by a close examination of the report members can ascertain the number of new places created by this bill, and the number of salaries increased. They will see under the heads of the different departments—Library of Congress, Executive Office, Treasury Department, and so on—the number of salaries increased in each particular department. We create 168 new places. Of these places 77 are created in the Congressional Library. The committee find, on a careful examination of the conditions there, that it is absolutely necessary, if the Library is to be utilized and be a benefit to the members and the public in general, that there must be increased appropriations, so that a proper index can be made of the books and the proper work accomplished that shall make the Library a benefit. In that number are included 15 places in the copyright department. The business of the copyright department has increased very rapidly. It is self-sustaining, it pays a revenue to the Government above the expenses of maintaining it, and we feel it absolutely necessary to give the copyright department the force that it desires.

I desire now to call attention of the members to the fact that in all of our Departments a number of clerks are now being carried on the rolls who are incompetent. And but for this fact the legislative appropriation bill would not provide, in my opinion, for a single new place. The Committee on Appropriations, by a section in this bill and one carried in the bill for the current year, 1900, have sought to avoid this difficulty and inserted this

provision: "That the appropriation herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the payment of any person permanently incapacitated." This provision was in the bill for the fiscal year 1900, but, notwithstanding that fact, we ascertain that in different Departments a great many clerks are carried who are wholly incompetent to perform their duties.

We find in the Auditor's Office of the War Department—and I want to say that the Auditor for the War Department is one of the most efficient officers that we have—we have 32 incompetent people, according to his statement; incompetent to perform a sufficient amount of services to warrant their being continued on the rolls. And yet they state that it is impossible to secure the dismissal of these persons; that the minute they propose to dismiss a clerk members of the House or Senators immediately come and insist that this particular clerk shall not be removed. We find there are 23 clerks in one office, where there are only 336 clerks employed, who are over 65 years of age; we find 9 clerks between 70 and 80 years of age, and we find 2 above 80 years of age; and we find all through the Departments of the Government that today they are carrying upon the rolls incompetent clerks, notwithstanding the provision of the bill last year, and this year they are continued to be carried on the rolls as clerks.

I simply call the attention of the House to that fact, for I believe there ought to be a remedy; and unless there is a remedy applied, the number of incompetent clerks will increase year by year until we shall have what will in fact be a great civil pension roll in the Departments of the Government.

We have continued for another year the temporary clerks provided for in previous sessions of Congress. It was recommended that a number of these clerks be taken up and placed on the permanent list; but the Committee on Appropriations, after giving this matter careful consideration, do not believe that at this time any number of these temporary clerks should be placed on the permanent list. The condition of work now in the Departments is such that we do not believe they can determine at this time as to the number of clerks that ought to be made permanent, so we have provided that the temporary force be carried for another year.

We find after careful investigation that it is absolutely necessary that this force be continued. Mr. Scofield, the chief clerk of the War Department, in reply to a question whether or not the whole temporary force would be needed, said that it was absolutely necessary that this force should be continued. The Auditor of the War Department makes a similar statement, and numerous other gentlemen state on this point that it is absolutely necessary that this temporary force be continued another year.

Mr. STEELE. I would like to ask my colleague a question, with his consent.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to know whether the heads of these Departments make any recommendations with respect to the "dead wood," which the gentleman has spoken of as now being there?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have no desire to involve this House in a discussion of the civil-service laws, but I will say that there are some recommendations from these officers of the Departments. Among others is one from the Auditor for the War Department, who gives his opinion in the following letter:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 7, 1900.

GENTLEMEN: Replying to your personal request that I furnish you with the ages and efficiency of the clerks in this department, I report as follows: I have 336 clerks and laborers on the roll. Of these, 15 are between 45 and 50; 33 between 50 and 55; 66 between 55 and 60; 40 between 60 and 65; 23 between 65 and 70; 9 between 70 and 80; 2 above 80; total, 188 over 45 years of age; 74 above 60 years of age. Of these, 32 are so low in their proficiency that they ought to be dropped from the service at once, but careful inquiry would lead me to believe that the opposition from Congressional and other important influence would be so great that there is not a single one that could be discharged upon the charge of inefficiency.

Also, replying to your inquiry as to my opinion regarding civil service as now applied to the Departments, the above figures would seem to me to indicate all that one could argue against the present rules, which will continue clerks of such ages indefinitely. The usual reply that is made to this—that it is upon the executive head to dismiss for cause—will not answer. The best evidence of this is the condition that exists. It is almost impossible to prefer such charges against elderly people as will make a cause for dismissal, in view of the fact that usually their experience makes them correct, even though the amount of work they turn off is not more than one-half or one-third the quantity that should be disposed of by a clerk drawing the compensation they do. The rules for promotion from one salary to another are such that a high-school scholar will stand better examinations for promotion than clerks with years of experience and who have proved themselves highly competent in the work they are doing, so that the question of efficiency in the work performed bears very little upon the right to increase of pay, and the theory advanced by civil service—that merit in the service is recognized by promotion—does not follow.

There are in the service to-day hundreds of clerks who make it a professional business of posting up on rudimentary education, so as to be able to pass a high average on the examinations provided for, and who are not worth anything at all to the public service, as they are indolent, careless in their work, and a hindrance to others in their work, and the conditions cited are not exceptions. I believe that some amendments must be made to the civil-service laws to correct these evils, as well as to reduce the average age of employees in the service. You look at my roll and charge me with having

336 clerks, but I lack very much of having that many efficient clerks, as I believe you will readily admit.

Respectfully,

F. H. MORRIS,
Auditor.

THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I believe it was stated by the Commissioner of Pensions that in the case of one incompetent clerk 14 Senators and a number of Representatives came there to insist that the incompetent ought not to be discharged.

So the only remedy I can see is to provide by law a tenure of office—to provide that clerks shall remain in office only a certain length of time; that if they remain longer they must be reappointed. Thus there would be placed upon the head of the Department, if he should undertake to reappoint an incompetent man, the responsibility of such action.

Mr. BROWN. Will not the gentleman put into the RECORD the letter from which I understand he has just read a sentence?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I did not read anything from the letter; I simply gave my conclusions.

Mr. BROWN. I ask the gentleman whether he will not put into the RECORD the letters which I think he holds in his hand?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I shall be glad to do so, with the consent of the House. I believe if we could so regulate this matter as to get out of these Departments the incompetent clerks, then in place of increasing salaries by 168 new places, the salaries could be decreased to the extent of 1,000 or 1,500.

I desire especially to call attention to every new place created and every salary increased. The members of this House no doubt understand that some of the provisions in the bill may be subject to points of order. While we believe that in every instance where the bill increases a salary or creates a new office the action of the committee was right with reference to the efficiency of the service and in view of the additional work which these employees have to perform—while we believe that these provisions ought to stay in the bill, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that some of these provisions may be taken out on a point of order.

The committee, in reporting this bill, have undertaken, in the report furnished, to put every member in possession of the changes that are proposed to be made, so that he may clearly understand what the committee have done. We have undertaken to furnish to the House complete information, so that by going over the report, which is brief, covering only some 21 pages, members may ascertain all the changes proposed to be made in this bill of some two hundred-odd pages.

We have placed upon the bill some limitations to which I wish to call attention.

Mr. STEELE. I wish to correct a wrong inference which might be drawn from a remark which I made a while ago. When I put my question to the gentleman I was under the impression that he was talking about the Navy Department instead of the War Department. In my judgment we have now in the War Department the most competent Auditor that we have had there in the last thirty years.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I agree with the gentleman. I believe that all members who have had dealings with the Auditor of the War Department will certify that he is one of the most competent men who have ever occupied that position.

Now, as to the limitations upon the bill, beginning on page 5, it will be observed that in connection with the Capitol police force it is provided that the captain and lieutenant shall be selected jointly by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; that with reference to the privates and watchmen, one-half of those men be selected by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate and one-half by the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; and that the officers, privates, and watchmen of the Capitol police shall, when on duty, wear the regulation uniform.

Heretofore this force has been selected by a board composed of the Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House. The committee believes that this force ought to be equally divided between the House and the Senate, and for that reason we put on that provision.

You will notice that we provide for inventories of books, etc., at the Executive Mansion. I think there is no question but what that provision ought to go on.

We provide further—

That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to detail deputy collectors of internal revenue in one district for special duty in other districts, and the deputy collectors so detailed shall be paid by the collector of internal revenue and disbursing agent for the district for which they are appointed and for which the allowance for their salary and expenses is made, the same as if all their services had been performed and expenses incurred in that district.

In connection with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of agents and the fees and expenses of gaugers, storekeepers, and storekeeper-gaugers in the Internal Revenue Service, the following:

Provided, That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to detail gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, and storekeepers appointed in one district for special or regular duty in other districts, and the accounts of gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, and storekeepers so detailed shall be adjusted and paid in the district where they are appointed, without regard to the number of districts in which they may have been employed in any one

month, the same as if all their services had been performed and expenses incurred in the district in which appointed.

That provision is necessary because, under a ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury, a deputy who is appointed in one district and who goes to follow up a case and work in another district would have to be paid pro rata out of the different districts. This provision provides for his payment from the district where he is appointed and where he starts to pursue his work, and has been the custom in the past, until a recent decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury.

Another provision in connection with the appropriation for public buildings and grounds in the city of Washington is as follows:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$27,130 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

That is for taking care of these little parks around the city, and the committee were of the opinion that one-half of the expense ought to be borne by the District of Columbia.

Mr. MUDD. What is the amount?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Twenty-seven thousand one hundred and thirty dollars. This provision passed the House at the last session of Congress, but was stricken out in the Senate.

Mr. MUDD. Where is that provision to which you have referred?

Mr. HEMENWAY. It is on page 6 of the report. It is the opinion of Colonel Bingham, in charge of the public grounds of this city, that this provision is just and ought to be carried on the bill.

We undertook at this time to take up and place on the permanent list the employees under the Secretary of the Navy who are paid from appropriations for increase of the Navy and other appropriations, but we found it almost impossible at this time, with so many new ships being constructed, to take up all the employees and place them on the legislative bill and provide for them specifically. So in order that Congress be informed as to the number employed by the Secretary of the Navy and the salaries paid we put this provision on the bill:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy to submit in the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1902, and annually thereafter, under the respective bureaus and offices of the Navy Department, a statement in detail showing the number of persons employed during the previous fiscal year and the rate of compensation of each under appropriations for "Increase of the Navy" or other general appropriations.

This will give to the members of Congress a statement showing the number employed and the salaries paid.

We also put on a provision in connection with the appropriation for draftsmen, engineers, and others in the Hydrographic Office in the Navy Department, as follows:

And no other fund appropriated shall be used in payment for such or similar services in the Hydrographic Office.

And also the following:

No expenditure shall be incurred or authorized for personal services or otherwise under the Hydrographic Office during the fiscal year 1901 except as herein authorized by appropriations under the Navy Department or under appropriations that may be made for printing and binding.

Heretofore in the Hydrographic Office they have been paying for personal service out of general appropriations. We undertook to appropriate in this bill a sufficient sum to pay for all the services in that office, and then to say that they shall not employ and pay anyone out of their general appropriation.

Members of Congress will at once recognize the necessity for this provision. If the Hydrographic Office can take general appropriations and employ indiscriminately such number of people as they desire, then we have no way of ascertaining the number of people who are being employed in the Government service and the amount paid to each; and it is evidently the desire of Congress to understand at all times who are being employed and how much they are being paid. And to avoid as far as possible the payment for personal service out of general appropriations, this provision has been put on the bill.

I should like now to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague for a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I should like to have a little more information about the condition of the public service in the various Departments. I would ask the gentleman if he knows or can approximate the number of incompetent employees in any one of the Departments?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I should say that in the Office of the Auditor for the War Department the statement shows that 10 per cent of the employees are—well, you might say, incompetent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Ten per cent?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Their efficiency is very low.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is there a like percentage of incompetency in all the other Departments?

Mr. HEMENWAY. In the General Land Office the Commissioner, Mr. Hermann, estimates that 40 out of 400 are incompetent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is 10 per cent.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is 10 per cent. Here are two very competent officials whom I have selected from the list—the Auditor for the War Department and the Commissioner of the General Land Office. Their estimates show 10 per cent of incompetent employees.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And the chiefs of these various Departments make that admission in letters addressed to your committee, do they?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, either in hearings before our committee or in letters.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And do they confess their inability to correct that evil?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They confess their inability to correct the evil.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Under the operation of the civil-service law are they not required to discharge incompetent men from the public service?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They are, but like all of us they are human, and while I have no desire to criticize Members of the House or Senators of the United States, when a number of Senators and Members of Congress come to these gentlemen and insist that an employee shall not be discharged, the gentleman can readily understand how difficult it is.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill reported by the gentleman carries an appropriation for the payment of these incompetent employees, I presume?

Mr. HEMENWAY. It certainly does, because the committee has no way of ascertaining who these persons are.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And no power to discharge them, of course?

Mr. HEMENWAY. No power to discharge, and we are simply bringing this fact before the House that they may understand the conditions. The Committee on Appropriations, by inserting the provisions found in section 4, on page 124 of the bill, has undertaken, by repeating what is now the law, to call attention to this condition and to bring about the discharge of these incompetent employees.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HEMENWAY. In just a moment. I will read section 4 of the bill:

That the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where is that provision to be found?

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is on page 124 of the bill. The committee seeks by this provision to call attention to what is now the law, and thereby to prevent the payment, out of sums appropriated by this bill, for the services of incompetent employees; but gentlemen may stand here and talk about this during this session of Congress and the coming session of Congress, and the incompetent employees will stay in the Department. If the head of a Department goes to a chief clerk and down the line to try to ascertain who are incompetent, I will say to you that he has a very hard job, because they do not try to aid him in picking out the incompetent employees. And why?

Mr. SHATTUC. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY (continuing). Because they are there together, they have been there together for years; friendships there are just as they are here; and they are not going to try to get the old incompetent fellow out that has been there for many years. We have got to have some legislation upon this question that will remedy this evil; and if we do not, it is going to keep on growing and growing until we are going to have a great civil pension list.

Mr. SHATTUC. Is it not your opinion, if the heads of the Departments should dismiss these men and put in the men that Congressmen and Senators recommend, that the Senators and Congressmen would not ask them to keep these incompetent people?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have no doubt that is correct, because when you give them the right to employ another man they would recommend competent men.

Mr. SHATTUC. Would it not be better for spoilsmen to recommend men who would be competent rather than to keep the incompetent men in the way they are now being kept?

Mr. HEMENWAY. In reply to the gentleman's question, I can only say, with reference to this temporary force that has been employed, it is admitted by those who favor civil service and are at the heads of the different Departments that this temporary

force, placed there within the last two or three years, is a very competent force; that they are more competent than the force secured through the civil service. They are younger men, men better qualified for the particular service to which they are assigned, and all along the line more efficient than the force secured through the civil service.

Mr. PEARRE. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he think it likely that the heads of the Departments and bureaus will appoint more competent men to the positions than those recommended by members of Congress and Senators; in other words—

Mr. HEMENWAY. In reply to that, I will say that when they ask for the appointment of any particular class, they designate the kind of a man they want. If they want an accountant, they say to the gentleman, "Will you furnish me an accountant?" and if they want an accountant you would not send them a laborer. It is the experience that Members of Congress and Senators, if given the opportunity to furnish a particular kind of man, furnish that kind.

Mr. PEARRE. Would it not give the heads of the Departments power to exercise their discretion solely, without any consultation of Members of Congress and Senators? These come from the people, and knowing what the people want, we would be more familiar with them than the heads of the Departments.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The head of a bureau would certainly get himself into trouble by doing that. There is no doubt but that Members of Congress and Senators would make his life a burden in a very short time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would like to ask the gentleman if these men were incompetent when they entered the service?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I think not. I have no information except such as I get from the bureaus.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Then how did they become incompetent after entering the service?

Mr. HEMENWAY. By old age and disease and the other ordinary ways by which men become incompetent to perform duties that they were previously competent to discharge.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am glad the gentleman has recommended action in regard to the estimates of the Navy Department. There has been a disposition there, even in the estimates this year, to lump such matters instead of specifying them.

Mr. PEARRE. What guaranty will there be that the heads of the bureaus or the Departments will not simply exercise their discretion in reference to their own incompetents rather than the incompetents of a member of Congress?

Mr. HEMENWAY. None whatever. I want the gentleman to understand that I am not suggesting a remedy. I am simply calling the attention of the House to the subject, so that they may study the matter out and suggest a remedy.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman from Indiana prepared to state about how many incompetent clerks are now employed in the Government service in Washington?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can give no more definite statement than I have made, which came from two most efficient officers, and they estimated that about 10 per cent of the clerks under them are virtually incompetent; very low in efficiency.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman believe that this provision in the bill will result in the discharge of that 10 per cent?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The same provision was in the bill for the fiscal year 1900, and it did not result in securing the discharge of the incompetent clerks.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman believe that one of the reasons for reporting so many incompetent clerks is the desire to have the proposition now pending for a civil pension bill go through the House?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly not. I do not think the gentleman had that in view at all. They are both very honorable and competent men. It was not volunteered information, but information asked for by the committee.

Mr. MANN. The information is ascertained from sources below the gentlemen who make the report?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I should like to say that for the last four years the Subcommittee on Appropriations having in charge the legislative appropriation bill have been trying to ascertain the number of inefficient clerks in the Departments. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] required at one time the different Departments to give the ages of the clerks, their efficiency record, and their employment, by which the committee could ascertain the number of inefficient clerks.

It was brought about by the Secretary of the Treasury saying, about two or three years ago, that he had a roll of honor. We undertook to investigate that roll of honor, and we then ascertained that all through these Departments were a great many inefficient clerks, and that they could not get them out. We have been undertaking since then to get them out, and in the bill for 1900 we put in the provision referred to, thinking by that to get them out. We have constantly urged upon the Department

officials that came before us that these incompetent clerks must be got rid of, and yet they do not go out; and they say that they can not get them out. I have no doubt that if this provision passed, that they will not go out, but will be continued there. I am only calling attention to the condition of affairs and the statements made by men in a position to know. They think the civil service is to a great extent responsible for the condition, and that there ought to be some amendment.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman any report from the Weather Bureau as to the number of incompetents in that Bureau? [Laughter.]

Mr. HEMENWAY. We have not; we do not deal with the Weather Bureau; that is under the control of the Agricultural Department, and goes to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SHATTUC and Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To which gentleman does the gentleman from Indiana yield—the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHATTUC. The gentleman from Indiana is looking in the wrong direction. The gentleman from Ohio is over here. [Laughter.] When the gentleman from Ohio is mentioned, it is not necessary to always look over on that side of the Chamber—there are others. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Indiana says that 10 per cent of the employees in Washington are regarded as incompetents?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I did not say that. We have the statement of two of the officials, who say that of the clerks under them 10 per cent are inefficient.

Mr. SHATTUC. Well, probably that will hold good as to all of them. How many employees are there in the city of Washington under the Government?

Mr. HEMENWAY. About 10,000 are provided for in this bill. Mr. SHATTUC. All together, I understand, there are 20,000; so that, according to the gentleman's figures, there are 2,000 men who are simply living off the Government's charity.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, I said about fifteen hundred.

Mr. SHATTUC. And yet, when we spoilsmen who recommend some old soldier who fought to maintain the Government and the flag—a good man—to take one of these incompetents' places, it is said that we ought not to have that privilege.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I would like to ask if the committee have made any attempt to learn from the Department the names of these incompetent clerks?

Mr. HEMENWAY. We did at one time.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Did you succeed in getting them?

Mr. HEMENWAY. We succeeded in getting a limited number.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I would like to ask if it would not be well to provide in the bill that the appropriation should not be applied to those specific incompetent persons?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman from Massachusetts can see that reaching through all the Departments that would be almost impossible. Congress could not undertake to name all the people that should be employed or discharged in the Departments.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I do not see how it would be impossible. It might be disagreeable.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I think it would be impossible.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me a moment?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. As my colleague knows, I am not this year upon the subcommittee that has this bill in charge, although I have heretofore been. He has mentioned the fact that I have some interest in this question, and I believe I drew the provision in the bill for this current year. Now, I understand that those in charge of the employees throughout the Departments told us last year that they had a large number of incompetents, or a considerable number of incompetents. We enacted into law a measure making it compulsory upon the various Departments to discharge these men. What excuse have they given your subcommittee this year for not complying with the law?

Mr. HEMENWAY. The pressure brought to bear by the members of Congress, as I believe I have already stated, and the statement, which I think the gentleman from Massachusetts heard, of the Commissioner of Pensions when he gave one instance where 14 Senators and many Members of Congress came and insisted that an incompetent employee should not be discharged. And the excuse given right along is that when they undertake to discharge one of these incompetent clerks, such pressure is brought to bear that it is almost impossible to get the employee out.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Indiana

[Mr. HEMENWAY] allow me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should be glad to answer.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what reason did those people at the Departments give his subcommittee for not putting out those incompetents?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If I may be permitted to answer, I will say that the subcommittee of which I was a member made inquiry, and we found that the question of superannuation was growing to be so serious a one in the Departments that the Secretary of the Treasury, in order to preserve the efficiency of the force in his Department, was undertaking to establish what, in effect, was a pension roll. We drew a provision, which was enacted by Congress, against the establishment of any such roll; we made it mandatory upon the various heads of Departments to discharge their superannuated employees. They have not done so; they have defied the authority of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that this provision will compel them to do so?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. This provision was in the bill of last year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not this provision, that incompetent employees shall not be paid?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes; that was in the last bill.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Yes, sir. They are simply defying the authority of Congress as a body, upon the individual representations of members of Congress. Permit me to give an illustration right in my own committee. The Commissioner of Pensions told us the year before last that he would be better off if he could discharge 100 clerks; that the remaining 1,700 would do the work better if he were allowed to select those to be discharged himself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did he not do it?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. We suggested to him, "Why do you not do it?" He had said, "Let me select the clerks, and I will better the service in my office with a reduced force and save money to the Government." We told him that he must do it anyway. He undertook to do it, and the very first man who came to him to intercede in behalf of one of the number selected for discharge was a member of our subcommittee. I am not going to say anything more about that, except that I was not the member.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And I was not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That being the case, does not the gentleman think there ought to be established an age limit, on attaining which employees should be retired, just as there is an age limit in the Army and Navy?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do. Although I believe in the present civil-service system, yet I will say that if we do not do something to meet this question of superannuation the service will break down.

Mr. WACHTER. I should like to know if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] can inform us what percentage of these incompetent employees are females?

Mr. HEMENWAY. We have no information on that subject.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Indiana allow me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I supposed that I was through with the gentleman from Ohio on this question.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has stated that the Commissioner of Pensions has said that if he could only discharge 100 clerks and fill the remaining places with persons of his own selection he could thereby greatly benefit the service. Now, does not the gentleman admit that the Commissioner of Pensions can not do this under the beautiful, far-reaching administration of the civil-service law; that where the removal of incompetent employees is desired there must be a trial before a sort of court, with a prescribed set of rules, to act upon each one of these individual cases?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio, I will say that I believe the provision to which he refers, but which I do not understand to go to the extent he describes, was an unwise provision. But I do not understand that there is any difficulty in the way of the head of a Department discharging any of his subordinates if he will certify that they are incompetent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there not an Executive order forbidding that identical thing being done?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not so understand.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Was not such a provision inserted within a year upon the demand of the civil-service organization?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not so understand. I do understand that a man can not be discharged except for cause stated, and after an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very good; that is just what I said.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. But I venture to say that if the

head of a Department, who is responsible for his work, undertakes to assert that the man is incompetent, that would be a sufficient reason for discharge. If that is not so, it is time Congress should go to work and make it so.

Mr. GROSVENOR. We know they should; but they will not do it. The idea of the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to be that if the head of a Department will only assert himself he may repeal the order of the Executive forbidding him to do what he undertakes to do.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I do not so understand the matter at all.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that there is no limitation upon the time; that each member obtaining the floor may occupy the time allowed under the rule. I give way to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana reserve the remainder of his time?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] is recognized in his own right.

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. I propose to yield any time to which I may be entitled to my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and will ask the Chair to recognize him at some later period in the day when he may claim the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. TAYLOR] announces that he desires to be recognized and to yield his time to his colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who will claim it and be recognized some time later in the day.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the bill under consideration in all particulars, and this morning I wish to consider a question which, in my judgment, it is our duty to the American people to consider, relative to saving a leakage in the revenues of the Government.

A few days ago the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and myself got into a controversy here over the question of deposits in the national banks. I made the assertion that we had a hundred million dollars of deposits of Government funds in the national banks, and that these deposits had as complete and as well recognized a value on the market in every part of this country as have cotton, corn, wheat, or any other commodity.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], ever the defender of banks, whether right or wrong, insisted that these deposits were not profitable to the banks, and said that the fact that only 69 out of 3,600 had qualified for this money was evidence that they were not profitable.

Believing that my contention was right, and insisting that only the powerful banks got the benefit of this gift of the Government, I wrote to the State treasurers in the different States of this Union and asked what they did with the funds belonging to the State.

I have had replies enough to show beyond question or any chance of controversy that the public deposits of this Government have as well defined a market value as corn, wheat, or cotton, and that that value on daily balances is as well fixed in New York, in Boston, in Florida, in Minnesota, and every other part of this country as any other commodity.

I insisted then—and these letters have but confirmed my opinion—that the policy of this Government, of giving the deposits to the national banks, offers a premium to the banks to precipitate a tightness in the money market or to precipitate a panic to get more free money.

Now, sir, I want to read to this House, and I want to appeal to every individual member of this House, not as a Republican or as a Democrat, but as the agent of the public to criticize these reports from the different State treasurers and see what the States make out of the money of the people deposited in the national banks at the different State capitals.

I will begin with the great State of New York, where, if there is a plethora of money anywhere, you can put your finger on it there. I will now read from the reply of the State treasurer of New York. In reply to my letter, the treasurer of the State of New York says "that the State receives on deposit, subject to check at any moment, 1½ per cent per annum."

Bear that in mind. In the State of New York, on the daily balances of the State fund, subject to check at any moment, they receive 1½ per cent per annum.

The State treasurer of the State of Kansas writes that they keep a fund of \$30,000 in a national bank in New York, subject to daily checks, upon which that bank pays them 2 per cent on the daily balances.

The State treasurer of the State of Maine says that that State obtains 2 per cent on their balances kept in banks in other States, and very probably in New York.

Now, let us see what they take on more permanent deposits. I read further now from the treasurer of the State of New York:

Banks holding canal fund moneys pay 3 per cent, as their deposits are more stable.

Now, my friends, that is what the State treasurer of New York obtains upon the funds of the State of New York.

The next answer is from the State of Pennsylvania. The treasurer sends me simply section 6, of the State statutes, which says that the State treasurer of Pennsylvania shall keep certain funds in certain banks, and those banks shall make all collections for the State without charge, and in addition to these services they shall pay the State of Pennsylvania $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum on the daily balances.

I next come to the State of Michigan. The treasurer of that State wrote me on January 27, that—

The interest rate has been usually 3 per cent, but that owing to a plethora of money in 1897 and 1898, the rates were reduced to $2\frac{1}{2}$ on the inactive and 2 per cent on the active accounts.

The treasurer of the State of Vermont wrote me on January 26—

That 2 per cent is the rate of interest received on the principal accounts kept by that State.

On January 23 the treasurer of Massachusetts wrote me this, which I want you to hear:

The amount deposited in the several banks at the close of business hours January 22, was \$6,978,898.49. Four million three hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars of this drew $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest, and on the sum of \$2,170,000, interest at 2 per cent is paid. Four hundred and seventy-five thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight dollars and forty-nine cents of active or working bank deposits, interest at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is paid, on which we draw every day.

That is in Massachusetts. Taking this as the average of the year, makes \$157,853.73 profit per annum on the public deposits of the State of Massachusetts alone, and on only a little over \$6,000,000; while we had, or now have, in the different banks to-day probably one hundred and fifteen million to one hundred and twenty million dollars.

I am sorry that our friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who believes that these deposits are valueless, is not in his seat when I make the statement that is given to me by the State treasurer of the State of Connecticut, who says that "deposits are made at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and that in the year 1899 the State received \$34,566.53 interest on the State deposits." That is what the State of Connecticut receives on the little deposit of that State.

January 24 the treasurer of the State of Florida wrote:

On those deposits, which are always subject to check, the State receives 2 per cent interest per annum, payable quarterly.

On January 24 the treasurer of the State of Georgia wrote:

We deposit with our State depositories and receive interest on the same at the rate of 2 per cent per annum.

On January 22 the treasurer of Maryland wrote:

Upon such deposits 2 per cent is allowed by the banks on daily balances.

On January 25 the treasurer of Kansas said that about \$20,000 of the funds of that State are kept in the National Bank of the Republic, of New York, as fiscal agent, and that the bank pays to the State 2 per cent interest.

The secretary of state of Colorado on January 24 says:

I have been informed that $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on open accounts and 4 per cent on time deposits are the rates we get in this State.

On January 24 the treasurer of Minnesota wrote:

The State is now getting on most of its deposits 3 per cent, making about thirty or forty thousand dollars per year.

The treasurer of Wisconsin on January 26 wrote:

The State receives interest of very nearly \$25,000 per annum.

Not giving me the rate per cent. The statutes of Nebraska make 2 per cent the minimum charge for State deposits, but Mr. STARK informs me they get from 3 per cent to 4 per cent per annum on State and county funds. Missouri receives from $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.69 per cent per annum, according to the report sent me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will it disturb the gentleman to supplement his statement about Missouri? We have a law out there, in addition to that, which requires that the county court let out the county deposits to the highest bidder among the banks.

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In my county the revenues run something over \$100,000, and a year or two ago one of those banks bid 6 per cent for the average daily balance.

Mr. BELL. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And gave good bond for it.

Mr. BELL. North Dakota. The treasurer of North Dakota informed me that they received 3 per cent on their deposits.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report says \$76,283,-

655.20 of public money was in the banks on June 30, 1899, or at the end of the fiscal year. And on December 17 a proposition generally stated was that the Secretary of the Treasury announced that he would increase these deposits from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 immediately, and on December 18 the Secretary of the Treasury ordered the collection of internal revenues of \$1,000,000 daily left in the banks, now making probably considerably more than \$100,000,000 of Government funds in the banks, without charge or limiting the amount of interest that they shall charge the people for the use of their own money.

If we say there is \$100,000,000 of the public funds in the banks—and I have figured up the average per cent paid throughout the United States to the States is a little over 2.7 on daily deposits; on time deposits, anything of a permanent nature, it is 3 per cent. Taking it, then, at 2.7 per cent per annum, and taking \$50,000,000 at this price, would give us a profit of \$1,035,000 interest per annum; and the other \$50,000,000 at 3 per cent per annum would give us \$1,500,000 per annum, or a total interest per annum on \$100,000,000 deposited in the banks of \$2,535,000, or a value of \$6,945 every day.

Now, it seems to me, after it has been shown beyond chance of controversy that these deposits have a fixed market value and that the money belongs to the Government of the United States, and it having been shown that it is worth at the lowest market value \$6,945 every day, that we are criminal if we refuse to protect the people in securing these great values that belong to them. I want to submit to the consideration of this House and to the country the query: Is it any more a moral wrong for the Government to allow these banks to ram their arms into the Treasury daily and purloin \$6,945 than it is to give them the free use of \$100,000,000 daily which has a market value of \$6,945, which market value is as well fixed as the value of wheat, corn, or cotton?

It is as great an injury to the people of the United States and as flagrant a neglect of duty of this Government to give away the use of that \$100,000,000 worth, in an eager market, the value of which is \$6,945 per day, as it would be to give those banks daily, without charge, \$6,945 worth of postage or revenue stamps. The Secretary of the Treasury might as well make them a gift of \$6,945 out of the Treasury, as equivalent things are equal to each other.

President McKinley said on the floor of the House on February 28, 1888:

Nearly \$59,000,000 is out among the banks. While for them they give to the Government bonds as security for the deposit—

Just as is done to-day—

and they are getting it without interest, and they draw the accrued interest on the Government bonds.

Just what they are doing to-day with these deposits. He properly and severely criticised President Cleveland for allowing them to have \$59,000,000 without cost, and at the same time he is allowing them to have practically twice as much in exactly the same way. He was right then; he is certainly wrong now. This Administration and the last one have, in my judgment, permitted the mammoth bondholding and banking institutions flagrantly to filch from the people more than a hundred million dollars in value. In the so-called popular loan of \$200,000,000, given them at par, when they were worth on the market from 106 to 109, there was an absolute gift of from \$12,000,000 to \$18,000,000. There is no controversy about it; the banks know it and everybody else knows it.

When I speak of banks fleecing the people, I do not include the little banks scattered out through the country—this pilfering impoverishes them as well as their patrons—but the great syndicated banks, the 69 of which our friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] speaks here, the association that is controlling the destiny of this nation. The financial bill now before Congress will be the most nutritious food they have had since they manipulated the bonds of the rebellion. They have put the interest lower than the bonds of any other country on the globe—lower than Great Britain—and they will be bought. Why? Because the banker can take the 2 per cent bond; he can walk over to the Treasury and he can deposit it, take out of the Treasury dollar for dollar in the people's money, gold, silver, or paper, take it home with him, get the use of that money for nothing, and draw 2 per cent interest on his bond. Who would not buy them? They could afford to buy them under those conditions if they did not draw a single cent in interest, as security merely.

The same banks a few weeks ago brought a Black Friday on New York, and not only made untold millions out of that Black Friday, but they walked up and made this Government give them more deposits for nothing. The Government had to buy its peace, or was rather glad to buy it.

In 1837 a great panic occurred in this country on May 10. The banks in New York all suspended, and there was a general wreckage, and yet Prof. W. G. Sumner, of Yale, states in his history of American currency that nearly all of these banks made big money out of the suspension and paid big dividends during

the year. I am sure there has been no panic since that time that the large banks—the mammoth institutions in the East—have not generally made infinitely more money than they do in normal times, and they cleaned up the small banks, they destroyed the little banks, and in ghoulish glee they said among themselves, "It is a benefit; it is simply cleaning out the unstable financial institutions."

If we adjourn this Congress without passing a law forcing the Treasury to let these deposits out at their market value, in the same way that the States do, we should be condemned to stay at home by our defrauded constituents. Where could this Congress do more for the people than by passing a bill that would force its negligent servants to collect \$6,945 per day of its dues in revenue belonging to the Government, and which is being awarded to the favorites of the Treasury Department, if not to political favorites? The ordinary banks of the country do not get the benefit of it. In the first place, they do not have the United States bonds to deposit, and if they did have them they would not have the influence to get the deposits.

If the one hundred millions were equally divided among 3,600 banks, they would only get \$27,777 each, while it has recently been shown by the press that the National City Bank of New York at times had a daily balance of from twenty to twenty-nine millions. At this rate you could only distribute to three banks the \$100,000,000. If the National City Bank of New York were given thirty millions, only five banks could be reached. If it got five millions, only twenty banks could be reached. The whole system tends to make the rich more powerful and the ordinary banks weaker.

December 23, 1899, Mr. Walker Hill, president of the American Bankers' Association, in an interview is reported to have said: "The banks derive a profit of one-half of 1 per cent per month, or 6 per cent per annum, on these free deposits." That was said when he was opposing the published intention of this Government to give the National City Bank of New York forty millions of the deposit. He said it was really worth this to the banks, although they only pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 per cent—6 per cent per annum. "The last statement," said he, "shows that the National City Bank of New York had \$13,000,000 of those deposits," worth \$780,000 per annum.

Those are the words of the president of the Banking Association of the United States in their row over the division of these free spoils; that the deposits of that bank before this renewed deposit was worth to the bank \$780,000 per annum, or a profit of \$3,126 per day, quite a handsome gift to the richest and most powerful and relentless financial organization in the United States. The \$100,000,000 divided among the banks are worth to them \$6,000,000 per annum. Take the \$76,283,625.30 in the banks at the end of the last fiscal year as the amount of money in the banks at that time, thirteen millions let to the National City Bank of New York out of this, and treating the other banks as liberally, 6 banks would consume the entire deposit, and the 3,594 other national banks would get nothing.

As to the State banks, it is an absolute injury to and a discrimination against those banks. It has a tendency to destroy and drive out of existence your State institutions. It appears that, from the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], only 69 out of 3,600 of these institutions call for these deposits.

Sir, it seems to me that if these flagrant evils go on much longer many of our constituents, who charge that instead of their representatives regarding a public office as a public trust they regard it more in the nature of a private opportunity to serve some great interest that boosts this or the other political party, will certainly be supported in their position by the proof.

Do not these flagrant wrongs justify the criticisms that are being thrown far and near from every quarter upon this body and the body at the other end of this Capitol? A few days ago the chancellor of the New York University Law School, while deploring our weakness and our failure to represent the people, said that the interest of our country in the great rivalry between corporations and the Government is coming; and where but from among the masses will spring the advocates of the people's rights? He was showing that the membership of this House was composed principally of the representatives of the great sordid interests and not of the American people.

A few days ago I noticed in a leading text-book in general use in one of the colleges of this city a statement that this is a time in the history of the American Government without statesmanship. This is the doctrine that is being taught to our children right under our noses and in the great capital city of the nation where we deliberate. And in Chicago, the day before yesterday, the mayor of the second largest city in the United States, welcoming the members of a great assemblage in that city, said that one House of the American Congress had become a gathering of the owners and representatives of trusts and that a few years more will see the House reduced to the same condition.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact, or at least is it not stated and

undisputed, that one of the present members of the United States Senate has recently been employed and is now the counsel for the Standard Oil Company?

Mr. BELL. I do not believe that the rules of the House give us liberty to discuss the conduct of members of either body by name.

Mr. GAINES. I have not given any name; is not that a fact as stated in the press?

Mr. BELL. I would say to the gentleman outside—

Mr. GAINES. I say it here; it is so.

Mr. BELL. I never knowingly transgress the rules of this House.

Now, does it not behoove us to lay down all partisanship and to investigate impartially some of these business questions in behalf of the American people? Would it not be well for us to take up the charges against our conduct made by no inconsiderable portion of the people and coming from most elevated sources and from all parties, and analyze for a while our conduct—see what we are doing, and "see ourselves," if possible, "as others see us?" May there not be some truth in the old adage that where there is so much smoke there must be at least a little fire? Should we not take up this great bank trust and see why we should give them our \$100,000,000 deposit when our people at home are drawing large revenues from their deposits of public funds? If Massachusetts had those \$100,000,000 in her State treasury, she would collect between two and three million dollars per annum out of that deposit.

Now, sir, I say that there are no two sides to this proposition; that there is in this House a favoritism toward these great institutions—a favoritism which permits them to plunder the public Treasury; and every part of the history of this Government establishes it beyond question.

You may go to the Treasury Department of the United States, and let it have a dealing with an individual, an ordinary citizen or laborer, and it will figure for untold hours to disallow every cent that does not come within the red tape of that organization. Yet it gives to the banks the free use of a hundred million dollars—worth nearly \$7,000 per day—a value established as completely as the value of the other commodities that are on exchange.

It offers a premium to these banks to wreck the market. And when the great banker of New York brought on that memorable "Black Friday" he got a great premium for it. He got his coffers filled with public money in order that he might let the people breathe. We had such a proceeding in the days of Jackson. We had the old Bank of the United States standing here and insisting that unless its charter was renewed it never would loan money to the people; it would not pay out the \$40,000,000 of Government funds; it would not pay out the money necessary to meet the pensions; it would throttle the Government unless Congress legislated to suit it. Jackson said, "Before this institution gets bigger than the Government, let us throttle it." And Congress did throttle it. We have now a banking power which is bigger than the Government; it dominates the Government; there is no doubt about it; and I am sorry to say that in my judgment five-sixths of the men who represent the people are interested in some kind of banking. I do not say that they can not be interested and be impartial, as but few of the banks get these special favors. But the men in the country and the smaller towns are injured by these great favors given to the great central banks.

As for me, I feel that we are plundering the people of this vast sum of \$6,945. Giving the banks the benefit of every doubt, and taking the lowest estimate from every part of the country and striking an average, the above sum is obtained. I do not doubt but that they could get from eight to ten million dollars if they saw fit, but the Government and the Treasury Department, which has been run so long by the banks, allow the banks these privileges without money and without price.

For one I never expect to stop talking of these great favors and of the flagrant neglect of duty of our Representatives until they treat these great institutions just as they treat the individual citizens of the United States.

I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I take the present opportunity to submit a few remarks on the question of pensions and the bad effects which our overgenerous pension legislation is having upon the country, or at least some parts of it.

From the report of the Secretary of the Interior it appears that there have been paid out on account of pensions and expenses incident to the execution of pension laws, from 1866 to 1899, the enormous sum of \$2,469,751,366, a sum so vast as to tax the powers of the mind to comprehend its magnitude.

The number of pensioners on the rolls in 1866 was 126,722. The number on the rolls in 1899 was 991,519. The amount paid on account of pensions for 1866 was \$15,450,549.88. The amount paid on account of pensions for the year 1899 was \$138,355,052.95,

and the estimate for the fiscal year 1901 is \$144,000,000. Thirty-three years after the close of the war between the States we have, in round numbers, eight times as many pensioners on the rolls as we had then, and are paying, in round numbers, ten times as much money on account of pensions as we did thirty-three years ago, and it is estimated that it will take at least \$6,000,000 more to pay pensions for the year 1900 than for 1899 on account of the Spanish war. I here read and make a part of my remarks a clipping from the Washington Post for February 7, 1900:

DELUGE OF PENSION BILLS—IF ALL OF THEM WERE ENACTED, THEY WOULD BANKRUPT THE GOVERNMENT.

Senator GALLINGER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Pensions, says that never before during his term of public service has there been such a deluge of general pension bills designed to take large sums of money out of the Treasury as now. He gives it as his opinion that if all the bills now before his committee should be enacted into law, they would absolutely bankrupt the finances of the Government.

The latest scheme that is being pressed upon the committee is to wipe out the pension rolls by paying all pensions in a lump sum, according to a table based upon the expectation of life as estimated by the American life-insurance companies. The advocates of this scheme have probably not taken the trouble to figure out the amount that would be called for, but it is safe to assume that it would run into the billions. Fortunately, there is no danger of a measure of that kind receiving serious consideration, but the mere suggestion of it shows the reckless views that some people hold in regard to pension matters.

What was intended as and in fact was a roll of honor is fast becoming a roll of shame. Those who seek to plunder the Treasury through one means or another are making use of the generosity of a grateful people and the popularity of pensions in order to accomplish their nefarious purposes, and a grateful people are getting tired of such abuse of their gratitude.

This matter of the rapid and reckless granting of pensions and the passage of ill-advised and ill-considered pension legislation is debauching the manhood of the country and deadening the national moral sense.

To prove this it is only necessary to investigate the applications for pensions made on account of the Spanish war and analyze the same.

Mr. Chairman, I here insert a list of 23 regiments of the Regular Army and 2 batteries that took part in the Santiago battle, with list of casualties and number of claims filed for pensions on account of service, as follows:

War with Spain.

Regiments of Regular Army.	List of casualties in Santiago battles.				Number of claims filed on account of service.			
	Killed.	Wounded.	Missing.	Total.	Invalids.	Widows.	Dependents.	Total.
First United States Infantry	6	52	—	58	74	5	4	83
Second United States Infantry	3	15	—	18	219	8	30	257
Third United States Infantry	8	33	1	42	134	6	15	155
Fourth United States Infantry	17	106	17	140	133	11	18	162
Sixth United States Infantry	33	93	—	126	193	10	46	249
Seventh United States Infantry	6	45	—	51	76	10	19	105
Eighth United States Infantry	4	27	1	32	96	8	21	125
Tenth United States Infantry	6	40	3	49	63	5	10	78
Twelfth United States Infantry	8	31	—	39	94	5	14	113
Thirteenth United States Infantry	18	90	—	108	64	7	16	87
Sixteenth United States Infantry	13	107	17	137	118	8	17	143
Seventeenth United States Infantry	6	27	—	33	109	9	18	136
Twentieth United States Infantry	1	13	—	14	145	4	17	166
Twenty-first United States Infantry	6	33	—	39	81	10	19	110
Twenty-second United States Infantry	5	33	—	38	109	—	19	128
Twenty-fourth United States Infantry	12	75	6	93	104	6	13	123
Twenty-fifth United States Infantry	8	27	—	35	60	6	7	73
First United States Cavalry	13	47	1	61	106	10	20	136
Third United States Cavalry	3	51	3	57	90	2	3	95
Sixth United States Cavalry	4	55	—	59	92	13	23	128
Ninth United States Cavalry	3	19	1	23	76	6	9	91
Tenth United States Cavalry	6	69	5	80	50	14	5	69
K, First United States Artillery	1	—	—	1	5	2	—	7
A and F, Second United States Artillery	2	9	—	11	21	2	6	29
Total	192	1,097	55	1,344	2,406	176	380	2,962

It will be seen that there were killed, wounded, and missing in said 23 regiments and 2 batteries of the Regular Army that took part in the battles of Santiago 1,344 men, and that there are applications for pensions for the whole number of said 23 regiments and 2 batteries 2,962, or 2½ applications to each soldier killed and wounded in these regiments of the Regular Army. I now read, and insert as a part of my remarks, a list of 8 regiments of volunteers who took part in the Santiago battles, with the list of casualties and number of applications for pensions.

Regiments of volunteers.	List of casualties in Santiago battles.				Number of claims filed on account of service.			
	Killed.	Wounded.	Missing.	Total.	Invalids.	Widows.	Dependents.	Total.
Second Massachusetts Infantry	5	40	—	45	424	15	28	467
First United States Volunteer Cavalry	15	76	3	93	209	16	16	241
Seventy-first New York Infantry	13	60	43	116	255	11	39	305
First District of Columbia Infantry	—	—	—	—	409	—	10	419
Ninth Massachusetts Infantry	—	—	—	—	552	15	78	645
Thirty-third Michigan Infantry	—	—	—	—	413	9	37	459
Thirty-fourth Michigan Infantry	—	—	—	—	466	9	60	535
Eighth Ohio Infantry	—	—	—	—	447	5	35	487
Total	33	176	45	254	3,175	80	303	3,558

It will be seen by reference to these tables that the 8 volunteer regiments had a total of 209 killed and wounded, and that the applications for pensions filed by these 8 regiments are 3,558, or 17 applications for pensions filed for each soldier killed or wounded, or, in round numbers, eight times as many applications for pensions by the soldiers of these 8 volunteer regiments as in the 23 Regular Army regiments calculated on a basis of casualties.

It will be seen that the above 8 volunteer regiments are from Massachusetts, New York, District of Columbia, Michigan, and Ohio—all from the North, where it is popular to favor liberal pensions.

I now read and make a part of my remarks a list of casualties and applications for pensions for 8 other volunteer regiments, as follows.

Volunteer regiments in the war with Spain.

Regiments.	Strength.	Casualties.				Number of applications filed for pension.
		Killed in action.	Wounded.	Died.	Total.	
First Alabama Infantry	1,651	—	—	16	16	71
First Georgia Infantry	1,331	—	—	11	11	65
First Kentucky Infantry	1,334	—	—	28	28	122
First Mississippi Infantry	1,141	—	—	30	30	66
First South Carolina Infantry	1,359	—	—	18	18	110
First Tennessee Infantry	2,026	1	—	25	26	174
Second Tennessee Infantry	1,419	—	—	15	15	93
First Texas Infantry	1,397	—	—	15	15	60
Total	—	1	—	158	159	761

It will be seen that the total number of deaths, killed, and wounded in these 8 regiments are 159; that the total number of pension applications by soldiers of these 8 regiments are 761, or, in round numbers, 4 applications for each death in these 8 regiments.

These last 8 regiments are from the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, where the pension evil has not reached the horrid proportions it has in the Northern States, and where the people are still willing to make a living by honest toil and are not knocking at the doors of Congress day and night for the passage of legislation enabling them to appropriate the hard earnings of other people to their own use.

Mr. Chairman, let us analyze the status of these 16 regiments of volunteers a little further.

In the 8 Northern regiments there were 35 deaths and 3,558 applications for pensions, or, in round numbers, 100 applications for pensions to each death reported. In the 8 Southern regiments there were 159 deaths and 761 applications for pensions, or, in round numbers, 5 applications for pensions in these 8 Southern regiments to each death.

In the Northern regiments there are 100 applications for pensions for each death, while in the 8 Southern regiments there are only 5 applications for pensions to each death, or twenty times as many applications per death in the Northern as in the Southern regiments.

It must be further remembered that all these applications are based upon alleged injuries received while in line of duty—are all for causes alleged to be of service origin.

Will any member on this floor arise from his seat and say that he believes that each of these applications for pensions in these 8 Northern regiments are honest and made in good faith?

I beg to call the attention of the House to what appears to be a

most remarkable fact in connection with these 8 Northern regiments, and that is that the fewer casualties the greater the number of applications for pensions.

In the Second Massachusetts Infantry the killed are 5 and wounded 40; total, 45; applications for pensions, 468.

First United States Volunteer Cavalry, killed, 15; wounded, 76; total, 91; applications for pensions, 241.

In Seventy-first New York Infantry, killed, 13; wounded, 43; total, 56; applications for pensions, 305.

In First District of Columbia Infantry, killed, none; wounded, none; applications for pensions, 419.

In Ninth Massachusetts Infantry, killed, none; wounded, none; deaths, none; missing, none; applications for pensions, 645.

In Thirty-third Michigan Infantry, killed, none; wounded, none; missing, none; applications for pensions, 459.

In Thirty-fourth Michigan Infantry, killed, none; wounded, none; missing, none; applications for pensions, 535.

In Eighth Ohio Infantry, killed, none; wounded, none; missing, none; applications for pensions, 487.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, that the fewer the casualties in these Northern regiments the greater the number of pension applications, all based upon causes of alleged service origin.

These figures and tables are all official, all coming from the Bureau of Pensions.

These eight Northern regiments had the following number of men enlisted and mustered out.

The regiments referred to are as follows:

Regiment.	Number of officers and men accounted for on muster-out roll.	Strength at muster out.
Second Massachusetts Infantry	943	841
First United States Volunteer Cavalry	1,237	1,137
Seventy-first New York Infantry	1,325	1,164
First District of Columbia Infantry	990	859
Ninth Massachusetts Infantry	1,334	1,197
Thirty-third Michigan Infantry	1,310	1,206
Thirty-fourth Michigan Infantry	1,334	1,198
Eighth Ohio Infantry	1,346	1,230

From the above table it will be seen that the First District of Columbia Infantry had officers and men all told at highest point only 990, and 859 at muster out. The applications for pensions in this regiment that never had a man killed or wounded is the modest number of 419, or a number nearly equal to one-half the full strength of the regiment.

Now let us look at the Ninth Massachusetts Infantry. Full strength of regiment, 1,334; at muster out, 1,197, with not a man killed or wounded or reported as having died; yet the applications for pensions are the insignificant number of 645, lacking only 116 applications of being equal to all the applications filed by the entire 8 Southern regiments.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. On what ground do these men, where there have been none killed or wounded, base these applications for pensions?

Mr. SIMS. That is a question which I want the House to answer. This regiment had about six months' service and now makes applications for pensions based on alleged causes of service origin, in number exceeding one-half of its full strength at date of muster out and lacking only 27 applications of being equal to half of the full strength of the regiment at any time. If this regiment had remained in the service another six months and had not been in a single battle or skirmish, the whole regiment would have been disabled and applicants for pensions, reasoning from the record they have made for the six months they did serve.

Mr. Chairman, if the Ninth Massachusetts Infantry is any criterion by which we may weigh the value of the services of volunteers from that State, it will be better not to ask for volunteers from that State in any future wars we may have. It must be certain that if these applications for pensions are honest and based upon honest causes of service origin, this volunteer regiment will cost this Government more money for its six months' service than any regiment of the Regular Army will cost the Government, including full term of service, retirement pay, and pensions. Those who advocate a larger standing Regular Army can certainly find much to strengthen their position from the records of these 8 Northern regiments.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn from this regiment of hardy New Englanders to the Thirty-fourth Michigan Infantry Volunteers. The record of that regiment is none killed, none wounded, none missing, and no deaths, with applications for pensions, 535. The full strength of this regiment was 1,334, and at muster out 1,198, showing applications for pensions, less 64, equal to one-half the strength of the regiment at muster out. I do not know the length of service of this regiment, but suppose it was about like that of the other volunteer regiments that did not go to the Philippines, about six months.

In case of the 23 regiments of the Regular Army, set out in the first table above exhibited, it must be remembered that they have been in the service ever since April, 1893, and are still in active service, and that the applications for pensions from these regiments of the Regular Army cover the whole period of their service since April, 1893, while the whole period of service of these 8 volunteer regiments from the North was only a few months, and that they have been out of the service for a long time and, notwithstanding this, that the applications for pensions filed by these 8 Northern regiments exceed the applications filed by the 23 Regular Army regiments and 2 batteries by 636.

Mr. Chairman, I now invite the attention of the House to a comparison of the 8 volunteer regiments from the South embraced in one of the above tables; and it must be remembered that the First Kentucky served in Puerto Rico and that the First Tennessee served in the Philippines from October 30, 1898, to November 11, 1899—more than one year.

The First Alabama, full strength, 1,651; deaths, 16; applications for pensions, 71; or 1 application of every 23 men, or 4½ applications to each death in the regiment.

The First Georgia, full strength, 1,331; deaths, 11; applications for pensions, 65, being 1 application to every 20½ men, or 6 applications to each death.

The First Kentucky, full strength, 1,334; deaths, 28; applications for pensions, 122, being 1 application to each 10 men, in round numbers, or 4½ applications to each death.

The First Mississippi, full strength, 1,141; deaths, 30; applications, 66, being above 1 application for each 20 men and only 2½ applications to each death.

The First South Carolina, full strength, 1,359; deaths, 18; applications, 110, being about 1 application for each 12½ men, or 6½ applications for each death.

The First Tennessee, full strength, 2,026; deaths, 26; applications, 174, being 1 application to about every 12 men, or about 6½ applications to each death; and it must not be overlooked that the First Tennessee served nearly eighteen months, and more than one year of this service was in the Tropics.

The Second Tennessee, full strength, 1,419; deaths, 15; applications, 93, being 1 application to every 15½ men, or about that, and 6½ applications to each death.

The First Texas, full strength, 1,397; deaths, 15; applications, 60; being 1 application to 23 men, or 4 applications to each death.

I invite the careful attention of the members of this House to these comparisons; and tell me what are the lessons to be drawn from them. Would any member of this House consider it an honor to be on a pension roll made up from such applications as those from the 8 Northern regiments?

Mr. Chairman, I have not selected these 16 regiments with the view of proving my contention. I am fully satisfied that if the records of all the volunteer regiments that served in the war with Spain were examined and compared the same results will be found to be true; that there are from five to ten times as many applications for pensions in proportion to length of service, strength of regiments, and casualties in the Northern regiments as will be found in the Southern regiments.

There is but one general cause that can be assigned for this great and astounding difference in the number of pension applications from the North and from the South. It must be due to a wide and generally prevailing depraved, debauched, and corrupted public sentiment that exists throughout the North and does not exist throughout the South, due to education and environment.

In the North the people have been taught that it is right to assist private enterprise by so adjusting taxation as to favor some at the expense of others, called, to hide its deformity and ugliness, protection.

In the North the people have been taught that it is right to create great banking monopolies by means of friendly legislation to the national and unfriendly legislation to State banks.

In the North the people have been taught that it is right to strike down one-half the redemption money of the people in order to increase the values of the fixed incomes of the wealthy at the expense of the poor and the wage-earner.

In the North the people have been taught that it is right to tax the productions of the Southern cotton grower out of existence in order to enhance the value of the products of the Northern dairy-men.

In the North the people have been taught that it is right to grant subsidies to millionaire shipowners by taking taxes wrong from the people and giving to them, simply because they have the power to do so.

In the North the people have been taught that the objects and purposes of government are not the greatest good to the greatest number of the whole people, but the greatest number of special favors and exclusive privileges to the favored classes at the expense of the masses.

In the North the people have been taught that it is right to secure legislation having for its sole object the benefit of certain

lines of business, certain classes of people, and certain sections of our common country.

Is it any surprise, then, that the brave young men from the North who lately volunteered to go and fight Spain, to liberate her oppressed and tax-burdened subjects, are not restrained by the same noble sentiments when it comes to thrusting their hands into the pockets of American taxpayers and robbing them of their hard earnings by means of fraudulent and unjust pensions.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and pray that such a state of things may never prevail in my own beloved sunny South. But like causes produce like effects, and I suppose the people of the South can be debauched by subjecting them to the same causes that have debauched the people of the North.

It is far better that no pensions be paid than that our national standard of morality should be reduced, than that our national character should be degraded. As far as the South is concerned, I say to you of the North, keep your money, but let us of the South keep our good name. We can afford to be poor, but we can not afford to be corrupt.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that a serious consideration of this pension evil be undertaken. We must throttle it, or it will throttle us. If the South were to-day in the same condition in which the North finds herself, no man can conjecture what would be the result.

Gentlemen on this floor are afraid to give expression to their honest sentiments for fear they may be misunderstood, for fear they may lose a few votes at home or cause their party to lose votes somewhere.

Mr. Chairman, securing votes by voting money out of the Treasury into the pockets of certain individuals or certain classes is securing votes by bribery, nothing more nor less. The same amount of money paid to the same individuals by candidates or party campaign committees would secure the same votes and would be nothing less than bribery.

Whenever the voters of this country cast their ballots with an eye single to the amount of money they are to secure, either from individuals, corporations, campaign committees, or from favorable legislation, then has our country reached that stage of debauchery and corruption which is the sure forerunner and presager of revolution and destruction.

I make the assertion that there is not in this broad land of ours a single volunteer soldier who served in the war with Spain who has not received numerous letters from sundry and divers pension attorneys, inviting and suggesting the filing of applications for pensions and making suggestions as to what was necessary to be done in order to secure a pension, and insinuating and suggesting the thought of procuring a pension, right or wrong, and inclosing blanks for applications. Such work as this bears an abundant crop of evil fruit, resulting in the debauching and corrupting of these otherwise worthy and honored fellow-citizens of ours.

Why are the applications for pensions from the Regular Army so few in comparison with those of the volunteer regiments? The regiments of the Regular Army are engaged in a much more arduous and perilous service than the volunteers, and yet applications for pensions from this source are not one-third what they are from these volunteer regiments of the North. The reasons are plain. In the first place, they are not subjected to the corrupting and debauching influences of the pension attorneys and are subject to the examination of competent Army surgeons.

The organized pension grabbers have a great weight in politics, and they never fail to use it. Just let an executive officer try to execute the laws and hold down the pension frauds and a howl goes up from that class, many of whom are members of that Treasury-fed, Treasury-fattened organization called the Grand Army of the Republic. No sooner do the Grand Army posts have a meeting than these same pension attorneys set up a howl against the offending officer and go to work to have him removed. Such has been the case with the present Commissioner of Pensions. So permeating and far-reaching is this baneful influence that Democrats in the North, in many instances, are as bad or worse than Republicans. It seems that in that section of the country where the pension crop exceeds almost any other source of money supply Republicans, Democrats, and Populists fall over each other in their efforts to execute the will and wish of this army of pensioners.

Mr. Chairman, it has almost reached that stage on this floor that in considering private pension bills the fact that the beneficiary of the private bill has been rejected at the Bureau is deemed sufficient excuse for the passage of the bill. No longer than last Friday night a bill was passed where the examining surgeons of the Pension Bureau had certified that there was no evidence that the injury complained of was of service origin. It is true that the one-sided ex parte statements of some physicians and friends and neighbors of the soldier stated that they believed the injury to be of service origin, and a distinguished member from Indiana, for whom I have the highest regard, charged that the surgeons of the Pension Bureau were under the influence and

control of the Commissioner of Pensions, and were bringing in such reports as he dictated. The people lose all protection in the granting of pensions when the honor and integrity of the sworn officers of the law are impugned on this floor because they determine that the applicant has not made out his title to pension under the very laws these officers are sworn to observe and enforce.

No longer than last Friday night we saw a distinguished member of this House, as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, when pension bills were up for consideration, refuse absolutely and repeatedly to recognize the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] who desired to address the House. The gentleman, from South Carolina had as much right to recognition as any member of the House, and was arbitrarily and wrongfully deprived of his rights while two bills granting private pensions, including amendments, were passed, and this arbitrary and unwarranted action of the Chair was loudly applauded by the Republicans.

To such an extent has this pension frenzy gone that in order to rush these private bills through in indecent haste the constitutional rights of members of this House on this side are ignored and trampled upon, while the majority on the other side applaud the outrage.

Mr. Chairman, when in the history of this House was ever a member refused recognition in Committee of the Whole to discuss a private bill of any other character? I have no knowledge of such an instance. Look over the record of last Friday night's session, when between thirty and forty private pension bills were passed, and show me where a single report was read or statement made in explanation of the bill except where the same was demanded by a Southern Democrat.

From whence is the money to come with which to pay this ever-increasing pension burden? It now comes out of the pockets of the consumers of this country, which means, in the main, the poorer classes, because under our system of taxation the poorer classes consume more of the taxed articles than the rich and idle.

Why not join with us in securing an income tax, in order that this pension burden may be borne by those who are most able to bear it and who are more largely interested in having the protection of our soldiers?

I am willing that an income tax be levied just sufficient for the payment of pensions, to be increased or decreased just as the demand for payment of pensions increases or decreases. While I believe an income tax is a just and proper tax for any and all Government purposes, yet, situated as we are, I am willing to compromise and take no more revenue from this source than will be sufficient to pay pensions. This would certainly be a great relief to the people. But our Republican friends are in a bad fix. If they favor an income tax, they lose the chief contributors to their campaign funds; if they do not do just what the pensioners want, they will lose their votes; and so they meet the demands of both by giving liberal pensions to the soldiers and collecting the taxes with which to pay those pensions from the poor consumers of the country.

Mr. Chairman, all these evils are the legitimate outgrowth and logical results of using the taxing power of this Government for other than strictly Government purposes.

Just so long as the powers of government are prostituted to private ends, to serve the demands of greed and gain, just so long will we be cursed with these and similar evils.

At this very moment bills are pending in this House to pension civilian employees of the Government after they have served a certain period of time or reached a certain age.

No sooner is such a measure introduced than a great newspaper champions its cause. I read from a recent issue of the New York Times:

Among the bills earliest introduced at this session of Congress was one by Mr. BROSIUS, formerly chairman of the Civil Service Committee, for the retirement with pension of employees in the service of the Federal Government. It is being urgently pressed, and it has strong claims on the favorable attention of Congress; but there is a good deal of opposition to it, most of which is unreasonable.

In substance the bill provides for the retirement of three classes of persons: 1. Those who have been twenty years in the service. These may be retired on their own request or compulsorily. 2. Those who have been thirty years in the service and have attained the age of 60. These may be retired only at their own request. 3. Those who have been thirty-five years in the service and have attained the age of 70, who must be retired compulsorily.

All these classes must have been in what is known as the classified service—that is, the service subject to the civil-service rules, though service in the unclassified positions may be counted in the term served. Each person so retired is to receive 75 per cent of the highest pay he or she has received while in the service. * * * It is not easy to see what logical or reasonable objection can be made to the principle of this bill.

We who have had an opportunity to observe know that thousands of people are anxious and clamorous to secure these Government positions in the civil list; that no one is appointed on the civil list who does not seek it and is not anxious to get it. The pay is good, far better than the average employment of a business character. Then pray tell me why should these Government employees be pensioned at 75 per cent of the highest amount of compensation paid them at any period of their service after they have served a certain length of time or reached a certain age? With

salaries ranging all the way from fifty to two hundred and fifty dollars per month, why is it that these employees are supposed to save nothing in a lifetime of such remunerative service and are finally to become a public charge upon their fellow-employees?

Who is to take care of the wage-earner or the farm laborer when he is old and unable to work? Who will say that it is right, that it is just, to tax the poor old worn-out laborer or farmer to provide a fund with which to keep up these high-salaried Government employees after they are too old to longer discharge the duties of their respective positions?

Mr. Chairman, I think there is grave danger of this very bad bill becoming a law. It is introduced by a very able member of this House, who comes from a section of this country that has never yet knocked at the door of the Treasury in vain. It is not more unjust than many other species of legislative favoritism that have already received recognition. It will no doubt bring to its support the hundreds of thousands of pensioners we already have.

I am afraid that it will give some gentlemen in this House the nightmare to vote against any kind of a bill proposing to grant pensions to anybody for any cause whatsoever.

The very word "pension" is both a charmer and a terrorizer of many gentlemen on this floor.

Mr. Chairman, if the Southern members of this House, who are not entirely dependent on the pensioners' vote for a seat in this House, do not take hold of this evil and by determined and long-continued effort root it out, no mortal can predict to what ruinous lengths it will go. Speaking for myself, I most solemnly declare that as long as I am honored with a seat in this body I shall never cease to make the best efforts of which, in my weakness, I am capable to root out and utterly destroy this monster of evil, and I call on all my colleagues of the South who have the courage of their convictions to stand by me in this fight. [Applause.]

Mr. PUGH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the balance of my time, I desire to yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

[Mr. BARTHOLDT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

When Mr. BARTHOLDT's time had expired, but before he had concluded his remarks, the following proceedings took place:

Mr. HEMENWAY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] can yield to the gentleman from Missouri a part of his own time if he desires.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have only about ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BENTON. Will that come out of the general time?

The CHAIRMAN. It must come out of the general time.

Mr. CANNON. If I can be recognized, I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized, and yields to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT resumed and concluded his remarks.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that motion will not be agreed to at this time.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that we have agreed upon a time limit for general debate as between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and myself, and we want to submit a proposition for unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are you going back into Committee of the Whole?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then we will go back into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BENTON. I do not want to make any trouble or interference.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that we shall go right back into Committee of the Whole.

The motion of Mr. HEMENWAY was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8347) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the legislative bill be closed to-morrow afternoon at 3 o'clock and that the bill be then taken up under the five-minute rule. That arrangement has been agreed to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] who is in charge of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that general debate on the legislative appropriation bill be closed to-morrow at 3 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia and myself.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is also asked that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY]. Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole, for the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

Mr. BENTON was recognized.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed, I desire to yield three minutes' time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the unjustifiable attack which the gentleman from Missouri who has just taken his seat has made upon the Irish people of this country. I listened with a great deal of interest to his praise of the German character and what the people of that race had done toward the development of this nation. I join with him in everything he has said in praise of these people who have done so much in all periods of the development of the country for the common good. I can not, however, understand his reflections upon the Irish people, and I hurl the charge back in his teeth when he says that "while the Germans are always found supporting the Government, the Irish are always against it." The statement which he has given utterance to seems to have been premeditated and can not be excused on the ground of thoughtlessness or any other cause, because the speech which he has just made was read from manuscript.

The members of this House know full well the absurdity of the statement which the gentleman has made, and were it not for the fact that it would be criminal to let a charge like this go unchallenged while there was a single individual in the House with a drop of Irish blood in his veins I would not dignify his statements by answering.

I would inform the gentleman from Missouri that from the inception of the Government until the present time in every hour of trial or peril the Government has found the man of Irish birth and Irish extraction always in the vanguard in the defense of the honor and glory of the Government. Does the gentleman say they are always found against the Government?

Why, Mr. Chairman, of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence nine were of the Irish race. All through the eight eventful years of the Revolution you will find a very large proportion of Celtic names on the military and naval rolls of the thirteen States. From Pennsylvania alone five Irish colonels headed as many regiments, made up mostly of men of the same nationality, and fought on the side of the colonists. Barry and O'Brien were the first two naval heroes of the Revolution, and Andrew Jackson—"Old Hickory"—the hero of the war of 1812, was of Irish extraction and some writers say of Irish birth. No braver hero of the Mexican war wore the uniform of the American soldier than General Shields, and every American loves to honor the memory of that fearless and intrepid fighter of the war of the rebellion, Gen. Phil Sheridan.

I have heard my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY] tell many times of the fear that was imparted into the hearts of the rebels when the news was sent along the line that the Irish Brigade was in front. "With coats thrown aside and their sleeves rolled up," he says, "they were the very incarnation of fighting men," and he has told me repeatedly in this House that the best fighters of that whole war, in his judgment, were the men who formed the Irish Brigade.

I would ask my friend from Missouri if the men of the Irish race and Irish extraction were against the Government in the recent war with Spain? If he thinks so, let him consult the records of the War Department. I know, speaking for my own State, which sent a larger percentage of men to the front, both in the Army and in the Navy, than any State in the Union, that the Irish boy, so called, was very much in evidence. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it would not surprise me, if the records could be obtained, to learn that a majority of those who enlisted from that State were either of Irish birth or Irish extraction.

In the struggle that is now going on in the Philippines I think that a large proportion of the men in the Regular Army are of Irish birth or Irish extraction. This was very forcibly brought to my mind one evening last week when looking over the columns of one of the local papers on the list of deaths reported by General Otis. Every one of the names reported that evening indicated that the soldier was either of Irish birth or Irish extraction. I think it is only fair to mention these matters and to emphatically

deny the charge of the gentleman from Missouri, who has made this unjust charge against the Irish people. There is no question in my mind that although a great majority of the Irish people in this country to-day feel that the war in the Philippines is an unjust one, yet they are with the Government in every effort to maintain the supremacy of our Army and the success of our flag in that distant region.

I think that a great majority of the people of Irish extraction believe as I believe, and as I expressed myself very strongly three or four weeks ago in a speech in Boston, that the right or the wrong of the war in the Philippines is not to be discussed now that the American soldier is at the front, and that it is the duty of every citizen to strengthen his arm in the fight against the enemy. The Government of the United States has indicated no policy toward the Filipinos, and will not until after hostilities cease and peace is restored in those islands. When that time arrives the Irish people of this country will be glad, as far as their influence can be exerted upon the Government, to give the people who inhabit those islands that measure of self-government which they show themselves capable of maintaining.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I emphasize the fact that in all periods of the Government's history the people of the Irish race have stood for the Government. Their sons in the city and the State and the nation have always stood for law and order and good government. In the hour of peril they have fought for the flag and given of their blood freely in order that liberty and freedom might remain the symbol of a great people. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] has the floor.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman from Missouri permit me to use two minutes of my own time?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I commend my friend for his defense of the race which he represents. I should have had less respect for him if he had not said what he did. My remarks were certainly not intended to be offensive or insulting, and I do not believe anybody on the floor took them in any but a Pickwickian sense. When I used the expression that the Irish are "agin the Government," I had in mind the old story which is frequently told of an Irishman who was shipwrecked upon a God-forsaken island somewhere. When he met a native of the island, he asked him, "Is there a g'uvernment here?" And the native said, "Yes, there is," to which the Irishman replied, "Well, I am forninst it." [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is adding insult to injury when he repeats that story.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] is recognized.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, the people of Missouri of all political parties have been so long at peace among themselves that the idea of one Representative from that sovereign State feeling it necessary to attack the laws of his State, and bringing the necessity to another member of this House from that State to defend them, will be strange to the people and is something that has not occurred in the halls of Congress since the Democratic party took possession of the State government of Missouri in 1873. Out in the great State of Missouri nobody has ever complained of our election laws in a serious way, and when they did and made their complaint heard, and showed that those complaints had foundation, the legislature has been promptly responsive to the request. After these thirty years of peace within the borders of Missouri, there comes a gentleman's voice on this floor—one of her Representatives—attacking the laws of that great State. I have lived longer in Missouri than the gentleman who represents the Tenth Congressional district, and I think my memory of the various laws of that State dates further back and is clearer than his.

In the beginning of what I am about to say, Mr. Chairman, I want to recur to the gentleman's constant use of the term German-American. Out on the prairies of that great State, along the running streams and on the mountain sides, we do not hear any such terms as German-American, Irish-American, Norse, or English, or French-American. Such terms are, and ought to be, offensive. When a German comes to my part of Missouri and gets his citizenship papers, he becomes not a German-American, but he becomes an American and a Missourian. That may be a familiar term to gentlemen in the city of St. Louis; but we out in the State, regardless of our politics, are of opinion that when a man comes to the United States and petitions our Government to become a citizen and renounces his allegiance to every foreign emperor, king, or potentate, he ought to be an American and ought never to be a German, Irish, Norse, English, or French American, for when he becomes an American citizen he can not have a grander title, and he ought not to have a prefix to it. [Applause.]

For the 150,000 Germans, Irish, English, and French that live in Missouri, I resent the prefixing of anything to the title of Ameri-

can citizen. The man is either a German or an American citizen. If a German comes here and does not take out naturalization papers, he is still a German; and if he does take out his papers and becomes a citizen of the United States, he is not a German-American, but an American citizen; and all of them that I have ever seen are loyal and true to our Government from whatever government they come.

The gentleman from the St. Louis district [Mr. BARTHOLDT] has seen fit to attack the election laws of our State, and in doing so has attacked our people. My colleague from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] the other day made a bold announcement without the record before him, that the record bears out—that there is not in the American Union a single State whose election laws are fairer or more honest than the election laws of Missouri. That was not always so. I have no disposition, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, to drag away the ashes from the embers of an almost forgotten period, but the gentleman from St. Louis almost immediately after beginning his remarks says: "I shall pull aside the curtain and scrutinize the election laws of Missouri." Let me say to him that we had an election law when I first became a resident of that State, and for several years afterwards, built on a plan to suit him.

In the first place, there was a constitution adopted in a fraudulent way in the spring of 1865. By the terms of that constitution every man who had borne arms against the Government or given aid or comfort to those who had, was not permitted to be registered or become a voter or serve as a juror. If he had been in the Confederate army or was in sympathy with those who were, he was not permitted to practice the profession of a lawyer or a doctor; he could not even preach the unsearchable riches of the Master. That was the sort of constitution we had for several years, beginning with the spring of 1865, in Missouri. We had in addition an election law which put the election machinery into the hands of three unequivocal radical Republicans appointed in each county.

Sixty days before each election it was the duty of a man who desired to become a registered voter in the State to go before this registration board in his county and prove, not only by his own oath, but by competent witnesses besides, that he had not been in sympathy with the Confederate cause and that he had been loyal to the Government of the United States. His name was then, when the proof was made satisfactory to this board of registers, put upon the registration book. Twenty days after the registration closed this board of registers went into executive session, and by its own action, where no one could say no—court or anybody else—deliberately erased such names from that list of registration in each county as seemed good to them. After the citizen had proved his right to vote under the Constitution and law, he was at the mercy of the registration board.

My young friend from Massachusetts, [Mr. FITZGERALD] has referred to Gen. James Shields. I want to call your attention to how that brave old man was treated in Missouri. He was the hero of two wars and a Senator from three States. He was the candidate of the opposition party, called the Conservative party, afterwards the Democratic party—because all the elements of opposition were called Conservatives then—he was candidate for Congress in 1868, and there were registered in the counties representing the district from which he ran something like 9,000 of the 22,000 votes. The registration officers cut off several hundred of those voters' names, and still the gallant old American, James Shields, was elected to Congress. The ballots were taken to the secretary of state's office in Jefferson City and destroyed, and a certificate given to his Republican opponent, who was seated. That was the kind of election laws you had in those days in Missouri.

In 1870 the Republicans fell out among themselves, and a large number of them through the State, believing that the election law under the constitution of 1865 was incorrect and not fair, insisted that the time had come, if it ever was to come, when men in the Southern army, and those represented by their friends and kindred, should be given the franchise. The disruption occurred, and I am glad to say, for I was on the scene, that the men whom my friend calls German-Americans, but who call themselves Missourians and Americans, were in the front of the great fight that helped to turn the ex-Confederates loose and helped to make them citizens and voters again. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In using the expression "German-Americans," I simply followed my friend Mr. CHAMP CLARK, who used it first, and whose statements about the attitude of the Germans in my district I was endeavoring to answer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never used such an expression in my life. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The RECORD has been read in the House, and I believe the gentleman said "Germans."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You bet I did. [Laughter.]

Mr. BENTON. I am exceedingly glad that the gentleman from

Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT] has begun to apologize for his un-American remark quoted two or three times. Very likely he will not use it any more on this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the Liberal Republican element got control of the State of Missouri in 1870; that is, of the State government. The legislature was not in their control, but by the amendment to the constitution of 1865 everybody in the State who was of age was permitted to vote. The Democratic party came into full possession of the State government in January, 1873—all branches of it.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I understand the gentleman to admit that it was the Republican party that removed the disqualifications under the constitution of 1865?

Mr. BENTON. No; but I have great pleasure in saying that a portion of the Republican party in Missouri, something like 50,000, did vote for enfranchisement, and, with the Democratic vote, it made about 40,000 majority in the State. Yes, a large number of Republicans in the State voted for enfranchisement, something like 10,000 in the gentleman's own city. I do not mean to take away the meed of praise from any man who ever does get right, even if he has once been wrong. And I say that a large number of Republicans, as many as 400 out of the 1,200 in my own county, voted for enfranchisement, and so all over the State, and I honor them for it.

The Democratic party got into possession of the State government in January, 1873, and in the election of 1874 the question was submitted for a constitutional convention and was carried. The constitutional convention convened in May, 1875. A very serious question at issue then, Mr. Chairman, was the enormous State debt which had been piled upon the people of Missouri and the way to manage it without robbing the people in the shape of taxes. The constitution of Missouri was made and ratified by a large majority, and we have now lived from 1875 under that constitution. Some men say it is a little narrow. While in some points it is a little narrow, yet that is the best possible thing that could happen to the taxpayer of Missouri. It gives the people control of the corporate interests of the State; it keeps men in excitement from doing things locally that they ought not to do; and while the constitution may in some points be a little narrow, it is the best constitution the people of Missouri have ever lived under.

Now, after the adoption of the constitution in 1875 we had this sort of election law. All parties and all persons could make any sort of ballots they chose—that is to say, anybody could print ballots for himself. He could, if he wanted to, leave off the name of the nominee of the party, and leave it blank and have his own or another's name written in. That law, when complained of by men of all parties, was repealed, and it was made unlawful to scratch off any man's name from the ticket except by the voter and give him an opportunity to insert the name he wanted to vote for instead. Our Republican friends in 1889 and 1890 made this complaint of the Democrats. They said, "Your election law is of this character. Every political party prints its own ballot; there is nothing to prevent a man going to the polls leading another voter by the arm and voting him, sometimes against his will." The complaint was made that "You Democrats have got the wealth, the power in the State; you have the large farmers, you have the bankers, you have the great majority of merchants, you employ the most men, and as long as you can walk up to the ballot box holding the voter's arm and handing him a ticket at the ballot box, you unfairly control elections because of your superiority in numbers, influence, and wealth in the State."

A large number of Democrats were of opinion that this complaint of our Republican friends was well grounded, and the law of 1891 was the consequence. That law we know as the Australian ballot law, under which the clerk of the county court is required to print all the ballots. At first they were printed all on one sheet, but afterwards a change was made so that each party had its own ballot. Those ballots are held by the county court clerk until a day or two before the election—never more than two days—and are then sent out to one of the sworn judges by a sheriff or his deputy and handed to the judges in the various precincts of each county. No man is permitted to come within 100 feet of the booth where the ballot is prepared. The voter on coming to the voting place finds two judges. What sort of judges? One a Democratic judge and the other a Republican judge (which is the requirement of the law), who sit there with tickets.

The voter is given one of each ticket. He then goes into the booth alone, fixes up his ticket as he wishes, folds it, and then goes to the ballot box, where sit two other judges. One of the receiving judges is a Democrat and the other a Republican. And mark you, one Democratic and one Republican clerk sit there to take his name down and put the same number on the book opposite his name as the judge does on the ballot before it is

deposited. When the ballot is deposited, the remaining ballots are put into a waste box. That is the election law of Missouri to-day; and here is exactly how it is executed. In Democratic counties, controlled by Democratic county courts, the Democrats always have three of the judges. If there is a considerable number of third-party men, they have one judge, and the Republicans have two. In a Republican county—and there are some thirty-two or thirty-three counties in the State that are usually reliably Republican—the Republicans have three judges sure, the Democrats two, and if there is a third party, that party one. There has never been any serious complaint of that law.

But that is not all. Under the election laws of Missouri as they have existed for two decades, the Republican and the Democrat and the Populist and the Prohibitionist and the Socialist-Labor men are entitled to have a challenger inside the election place to sit by the box where the ballots are deposited, who has authority to object to any voter, giving his reasons therefor; and he has the right to stay there until the ballots are counted and strung and put back into the box and sealed up. The Republicans have exactly the same rights as the Democrats. If a man comes to the polls and offers his vote, if he is a Republican a Democrat may challenge his vote, or vice versa; but his vote must be accepted if four of the six judges declare that he is entitled to vote.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. As I understand, the gentleman is discussing the election laws of Missouri.

Mr. BENTON. The election law as applying to counties. I will come later to the law as to cities.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I would like to ask my colleague whether he is familiar with the Nesbit election law?

Mr. BENTON. I think so, as to its general terms. I have been following it through and pencil marking it for two days.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. The speech my friend is making does not seem to agree with that law.

Mr. BENTON. Wait. As I was saying, no man offering to vote at any precinct can be deprived of his vote if four of the judges concur in deciding that he is entitled to vote. These men who watch the voting are appointed by the several political parties. They are entitled to remain until the whole matter is through. Such is the election law of the State of Missouri.

Now, complaint is made by the gentleman from St. Louis of what is known as the Nesbit election law which applies to cities of 300,000 inhabitants and over. I am going to read from that law, and I stand ready to be challenged about any section of it. I am going to read freely from its provisions. The reading may be a little tiresome. But since the election laws of my State have been attacked by a Missouri Representative it is right that this House should know what those laws are.

Mr. THROPP. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly.

Mr. THROPP. Before the gentleman proceeds to discuss the law with reference to cities I wish to ask him, Are your voters registered?

Mr. BENTON. There is no registration in the country. In towns of 5,000 inhabitants and over there is for city elections, but in smaller places there is not.

Mr. THROPP. There is registration in the cities?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, in large cities, for all elections.

Mr. THROPP. Can the members of either party appoint any of those judges, or are they appointed by the court?

Mr. BENTON. By the courts of the counties out in the State; but the law requires that the courts give to the opposite party half the judges and half the clerks.

Mr. THROPP. As I understand, then, a Democratic court is required to appoint men who represent the Democratic party and the Republican party?

Mr. BENTON. Oh, yes; and in the same way a Republican court is required to appoint Republican and Democratic judges.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it may be well for my friend to understand one thing. The city of St. Louis is a city under a separate charter.

Mr. BENTON. I do not want my time taken up.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman decline to yield?

Mr. BENTON. I can not yield.

Mr. THROPP. I wished only to ask a question for information.

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. THROPP. When the voter presents himself there, if he is a voter who can not well understand how to mark his ticket, who is allowed to help him mark it?

Mr. BENTON. I ought to have explained that. I am very thankful to the gentleman for that suggestion. If a voter comes in and asks for a ballot and says, "I am unable to fix my ballot," for any reason—he may be partially blind, or he may be so illiterate that he can not read or write, or he may be crippled; under those circumstances the law requires that the judge whom he selects—that is, one of these distributing judges from whom the voters get the tickets—shall mark the ballot the way he wants it.

When we had the blanket ballot, if he wanted to vote the Republican ticket, his Republican judge scratched out the Democratic name by drawing a line through it, the People's Party, the Prohibition ticket, and so on, and left the Republican column unmarked. Then I if he said, "I want to vote for John Smith for constable," whose name was on the Democratic ticket, the judge scratched out the name of the Republican candidate and wrote in the name of the candidate for whom he wished to vote. Now, the judges are required under oath to keep the secret of how that man voted.

Mr. THROPP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have had something to do with elections since I myself was enfranchised in 1870, and I have never seen a legislative enactment on the subject of elections that is clearer and fairer than the election law of Missouri.

In framing the Australian-ballot law we took advantage of the Australian-ballot law in several other States—one of the New England States and one of the middle Western States—and based our election law upon it.

I speak certainly for the country districts of Missouri when I say there has never been any idea in that State that there was anything like general fraud. Now and then we hear of a fellow being bribed to put some particular name on his ballot; but as to wholesale fraud and corruption, it has been absolutely unknown for nearly thirty years in Missouri. I do not pretend to say that every man who votes at any particular ballot box in Missouri is absolutely an honest voter; but the judges and clerks of election believe he is, and the men who watch the ballot box and who watch the counting of the ballots believe he is. I say, of course, in a small way there is wrong occasionally; but as far as the working of the election law in Missouri is concerned, the perfection of that working is due to the efforts of honest legislators. We passed the Australian ballot law, so that nobody could prevent a man voting just as he likes one time and no more.

Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman allow a question there?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is it not a fact that the election law which the gentleman speaks about now was passed by a Republican house in Missouri?

Mr. BENTON. No, sir—ee, bob.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I know it is a fact.

Mr. BENTON. Well, I know it is not a fact. I know when it was passed. It was passed by that legislature that reelected GEORGE G. VEST for a third term to the United States Senate, and gave him 36 majority in the house and 14 in the senate. That is the legislature which passed it, and it was in 1891.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I say the last election law—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I say the last election law, which was repealed as far as the city of St. Louis was concerned, and for which the so-called Nesbit bill was substituted. That law was enacted by a legislature of which the house was Republican. The Republican house had passed it, but the legislature adjourned without having taken action upon it. Thereupon, by force of public opinion, the governor had to recall that legislature, and then that law was passed by both houses and signed by the governor. That was the history of it.

Mr. BENTON. The gentleman is so anxious to get to wading in the mud of St. Louis politics that he will not wait until I get to the St. Louis election law in the course of my remarks. I was finishing up about the State election law, at the instance of my friend on my left [Mr. THROPP], and making some explanations that I had failed to make in the beginning.

I challenge now the attention of this House to what these gentlemen call the Nesbit election law. The gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. BARTHOLDT] said the other day that if that law was permitted to stand there would not be any more Republican members of Congress from the city of St. Louis. God grant that his statement is true. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I say that with all due respect to the gentlemen who now occupy seats on this floor from that city.

Now, I want to say something to you about the election law for St. Louis, and why the Nesbit election law was passed. The gentleman is mistaken when he says that the governor, by force of public opinion, was forced to call the legislature in special session to pass this election law. Nothing on earth is farther from the truth.

The disposition of the people of the State was to pass a most stringent railroad law and a fellow-servant law. The legislature at its main session was composed of a Democratic senate and, remarkable to relate, for the first time since enfranchisement in 1870, of a Republican house. That was the time that the Democrats cut off their noses to spite their faces, and 60,000 of them would not vote at all, and 11 Republican Representatives from that State were rolled into this Hall, and the lower house of the

legislature was Republican. The governor felt that the desire of the people should be followed out, and he did what I thought and said to him was a mistake. I was in sympathy with its purpose, but did not believe it could be accomplished. The object and purpose in his mind was to get legislation favorable to the laboring element of the State on the subject of railroads.

When they got there the only thing they accomplished was to pass a compromise, unsatisfactory election law. Well, somebody says, what complaint have you to make of the election law of 1895? It is this: It took the election machinery out of the hands of the people and their immediate representatives and the executive branch of the Government and put the finality into the hands of the circuit judges, whose business it is to try lawsuits, not to decide who should be judges and clerks of election. That was my own individual objection to it.

But I want to tell you, gentlemen, why the election law of 1899 was passed. I want to call your attention now to some figures on the subject of elections. I want to be just about as dispassionate as a reasonable man can be; but it is enough to make a man who knows the history of Missouri a little hot under the collar when a newcomer jumps on the great State of Missouri and says he wants "the curtains pulled aside and the whole thing shown up." We may say things we ought not to say. I will try to be parliamentary, but I will tell you why we passed the election law of 1899. We did it in the interest of having every man who was entitled to vote in the city of St. Louis vote in the particular precinct where he lives, where his neighbors were acquainted with him, and for the purpose of permitting him to vote once and not more than once.

The people of the State of Missouri became alarmed at the election performances that took place in St. Louis. The growth of the Republican vote in the State was large, but so was the growth of the Democratic vote in the State large. It was a splendidly healthy vote. But the growth of the Republican vote in St. Louis was so abnormal, beginning with 1895, and especially in 1896 and 1898, that the people of the State rose and demanded of their representatives in both branches of the legislature that such an election law should be passed as that the gentleman's friends, who control the city of St. Louis, could not bring men from New Orleans and Vicksburg and Memphis and Cairo and all up and down the Mississippi River and register them from five to eight times in the city and vote them in the election following. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That was never done.

Mr. BENTON. Why, of course, I rarely ever knew a man in my life who received stolen goods to confess it in open court. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Is not that the same kind of people who had ropes threatened for them by the people the other day in St. Louis?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, sir. Let me show how the State of Missouri has grown in voting power. It will throw much light on the situation. In 1880 the Democratic vote was 208,000 in round numbers, the Republican vote 153,000, and the vote of the third party, with Mr. Weaver at the head of it, 33,000. That year the vote of the city of St. Louis was, Democratic, 24,000; Republican, 23,000; Greenback, 900.

In 1882 the Democratic vote in the State was 199,000, and it was an off year, and the Republican vote was 128,000, the Greenback, 33,000. In the city of St. Louis the Democratic vote was 16,900, the Republican vote 11,300, and the Greenback vote 2,200. In 1884 the Democratic vote was 236,000, only a rise in the whole State from 208,000, whereas the Republican vote was 203,000, rising from 153,000 in 1880; and I will explain how that was done. Much has been said by Republicans about the decay and infernality of Populism. In 1894, strange to relate, our Republican, gold-standard, gold-bond friends, who have so much to say about taking care of the Government and protecting its credit, made a bargain with our Greenback friends in the State, had a joint convention and gave to our Greenback folks half the electoral ticket, and voted a solid vote against the Democratic party and swelled their vote abnormally over that of the Democratic vote; yet they were 30,000 behind, but they joined hands with those they claim are anarchists.

That same year the city of St. Louis gave for Cleveland 22,000, for Blaine 21,000, including the third party copartnership. I want to show you now that in all these years the Democratic party controlled the great city of St. Louis by a small majority, as well as the State. In 1886 the Democratic vote in the State was 230,000 and the Republican 178,000 and the third party vote 13,000. They had separated again, and the Republican vote fell wonderfully behind that of 1884. In the city of St. Louis the Democratic vote was 18,000, in round numbers, and the Republican vote 15,000. Still a majority of 3,000 for the Democrats. In 1888, a Presidential year, the whole vote of the State was, Democratic, 262,000; Republican, 235,000; the third party, 18,000; the fourth party, 4,000. In the city of St. Louis the Democratic

vote was 27,000 and the Republican vote 32,000, showing the Republicans had changed the vote to a majority for their party. But we can readily get at the cause.

The Democratic party was made obnoxious by a lot of vetoes of pension bills, and for a while it looked as if the whole of the Union soldier vote was going to leave the Democratic party, and it affected the St. Louis vote. In 1890 the vote in the State for the Democratic party was 260,000, the Republican vote 188,000, a decrease. In that year the Democratic vote in the city was 25,000, the Republican vote 21,000. Our party had righted itself, and the city went with a nominal majority of from 2,000 to 4,000 Democratic. In 1892 there was not a tremendous increase of votes in the State above that of 1888. The vote in the whole State was 270,000 Democratic, 227,000 Republicans, and 41,000 third party, the latter vote a protest against our nominee for President.

In the city of St. Louis the vote was, Democrats 34,000, and Republicans 35,000. The Republicans carried the city and elected two members of Congress; and I want to call attention to that. I do not pretend to defend everything the Democratic legislature did in 1891. It was just like legislatures always do. If it had been a Republican legislature it would have done the same thing, only in a different way. There was a districting bill passed, which my Republican friends call a gerrymander, by which one powerful Republican district was formed of two counties of the State and part of the city of St. Louis and turned over to our Republican friends, to the common enemy; and when I tell you that since that time the unfortunate people of that part of Missouri have been compelled to stand the gentleman who spoke to-day as a representative you will know what a misfortune occurred to them. [Laughter.]

In 1894, as I said, a large number of Democrats did not vote at all, and we were beaten more. In 1896—now mark you—the Democratic vote of the State had risen to 365,000 and the Republican vote to 304,000. In the city of St. Louis the Democratic vote had risen to 50,000 and the Republican vote to 66,000. In other words, the splendid gain of the Democratic vote from thirty-five to fifty thousand in four years was 15,000, and the increase of the Republican vote in that same time was more than 30,000. The people of the State became satisfied that there was no such great disparity in the number of Republicans and Democrats that had come into the State; the money question could not account for it, because our vote increased 15,000. They did not believe, in the natural way of making voters, that the Republicans had been any more industrious than the Democrats. They were of the opinion that something was wrong, and the people of the State, as they had a right to, demanded that an election law be made strong enough to go to the bottom of things, so that a political party sixty-odd thousand in the minority in the State should not double its vote up from thirty-five to sixty-six thousand in four short years in St. Louis, and thus attempt to nullify the will of the people of the State.

But, you say, did the Republicans follow it up? Yes; in 1898, an off year, the Democratic vote maintained itself at 40,000, coming within 10,000 of its great vote in 1896, a Presidential year; the Republican vote held itself at over 50,000. And therefore to probe to the bottom this unprecedented Republican vote our election law of 1899 was passed. What are the provisions of that law? If there is any gentleman here who wants to call my attention to any particular provision of it, I will give him time. I shall go over the provisions of the law. By virtue of the provisions of the law of 1899, known as the Nesbit election law, for cities of 300,000 and over, the governor is required to appoint three commissioners, to be men of probity, and one of whom must be a member of the leading political party next to the dominant party in the State. We also had three commissioners under the law of 1895.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not rather a serious trust to place in the hands of a Democratic governor to appoint a Republican election commissioner?

Mr. BENTON. Certainly not, when he is dealing with the kind of radicals you have in St. Louis. [Laughter.] Men that will pile up their votes in four years thirty-odd thousand ought not to be permitted to cover that work, especially when you give St. Louis such a city administration as the present. But I want to say seriously in reply to that, that there has never been a Democratic governor in Missouri who has ever made an appointment of a serious character that has been successfully attacked.

The Republican commissioner appointed by our governor under the Nesbit law is a man of high character. Of course the minority would like to have its central committee name the member of the commission. They would like to have the central committee name the judges and clerks of election, but that is not permitted by the laws of Missouri. County courts do it in the country and election commissioners in the city. These commissioners are required to select four judges of election. But, in the first place, they are required to divide the great city of St. Louis

into election precincts, which must be of contiguous territory, and they must be as nearly in blocks as possible, and must have, as near as may be, 400 voters in a precinct. What was the reason of that? So that the inhabitants of that block might know their neighbors, where they came from, where they lived, how long they had lived there, and whether they were honest voters.

Does any honest man kick on that proposition? If there is a Republican on that side of the House—and there are plenty of you honest over there, just as good as we are—is there one that says that is not a good law, to make an election precinct as small as possible, even if it costs a little more money for judges and clerks, so that every voter can know that in the one, two, three, four, or five blocks who the voters are in his precinct and how many there are? That is one of the serious things that hurts the Republican machine in St. Louis in this election law—the fact that we are going to divide the great city into precincts where there are not over 400 people in one precinct to vote and where voters are known.

What is the next thing? Election commissioners, after having given a \$10,000 bond, are required to appoint a deputy commissioner, who is to act as their secretary, and it is made their duty to appoint four judges. Now, I do not think my friend from St. Louis [Mr. BARTHOLDT] has been in the American Congress long enough to get brazen, but he made a serious mistake in his declarations the other day in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. He said no Republican had any chance to be a judge of election.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption right there?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The law provides that two Republicans and two Democrats shall be appointed judges in each precinct. Is it not a fact that the three election commissioners will appoint such Republicans as suit them? Is it not possible that they will appoint four Democrats and call two of them Republicans, as was done under the old law, which the gentleman praises so much?

Mr. BENTON. No; I deny it. Now, let me read the law as it is:

Such board of commissioners shall choose four electors as judges of election and two clerks for each precinct in such city. * * * Two of said judges and one of said clerks shall belong to and be members of the party of opposite politics to the other two judges and clerk.

Now, of course, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] is not a lawyer, but he knows as a matter of history and tradition that there are such things as courts in Missouri, and that if the Democrats should violate the plain mandates of the law, the courts would be open to him. Does he not know that the election would be vitiated if they violated this section of the law, that it would invalidate the election in that ward or precinct?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. How can you tell? Suppose they appoint a Democrat and call him a Republican; and suppose when the man is called to account he says, "Yes; for the purposes of this election I am a Republican. I have changed my political faith since last night."

Mr. BENTON. Now, as the gentleman must see, that is all a matter of guesswork. My colleague constructs for himself a straw man in order that he may knock him down. He has been so used to the infernal politics of his party in the city of St. Louis for the last four years that he does not think anybody is honest. Why, gentlemen, here is the fact about it: They are compelled to appoint these four judges sixty days at least before the election.

Mr. THROPP. Are they obliged to announce them?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; their names must be published; they must be voters in the precinct where they are judges; must be capable men and not candidates. But that is not all. These commissioners elect two clerks, and it is the business of the clerks to go around from house to house to make up and verify their lists of men already registered, and the law requires that no one of the clerks shall go except in company with the other, and that the clerks must be of opposite politics.

Mr. THROPP. Suppose that one or two of those commissioners are objectionable to the party, or to members of the party, which they are chosen to represent. Is there any way by which the regular organization of that party can have others substituted?

Mr. BENTON. Not unless they can show that the commissioners are not members of that party, or can show that they are personally dishonest, or that they are criminals or ex-criminals, or for other lawful reasons are disqualified. The whole of the criminal laws of the State are spread over this election law. No one has a right to come in and say, "We do not want John Smith for judge." We sometimes allow them to come in, but it is not the rule. The rule is for the Republican courts in Republican counties to name the judges and in Democratic counties for the Democratic court to name the judges. As we have seventy-odd counties to their thirty-odd, of course we have more judges in the State than they have.

Mr. THROPP. Why not amend your law so as to allow the regular organization of each party to choose its election officers in the county?

Mr. BENTON. It never has been the law in the State of Missouri to do that. The power has always been lodged in the county court in outside counties. We have never had political parties (except as they controlled the courts) meddling with the business assigned to the court.

Mr. THROPP. Do you not think the plan I have suggested would bring the officers closer to the people and that the system would be more in conformity with the representative idea?

Mr. BENTON. No; I do not. I would rather trust a Republican county judge than a Republican committeeman, because the county judges elected by the Republicans are usually as straight men as the Democratic judges are.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Does not my friend know that in regard to the appointment of judges and clerks under the law he is now discussing the courts have no jurisdiction to make inquiry into the matter?

Mr. BENTON. Of course they have not the right which they had under the law of 1895, but it is idle and incorrect for the gentleman to say that courts have no power when the law is violated.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. That is just what is the matter with the law.

Mr. BENTON. The courts have not the right to nullify what the commissioners have done by ordinary petition under the law of 1899. Under the law of 1895, if anybody kicked, or if nobody kicked, the circuit judges took under advisement the list of judges and purged them on any complaint that satisfied them. We said, "The criminal laws of the whole State should apply to St. Louis as well as to the other portions of the State; the nisi prius courts should not control at all, except when the provisions of the law were openly violated, and if the commissioners authorized by law to appoint judges and clerks violate the law, either in St. Louis or throughout the State, there should be an appeal to the law in St. Louis as well as in Springfield or elsewhere."

The trouble with the gentlemen from St. Louis is this: The majority of the judges of the circuit courts are of their making; most of them were elected in 1896 and in 1898. They, the Republicans, evidently think—I do not think so, for I believe that the judiciary of St. Louis is composed of fair men—they evidently believe that the judiciary of St. Louis can be manipulated in the interests of a particular party organization. That is the only trouble with you about this election law. It is simply that the Republicans are worried to death because the machinery is put in the hands of honest men—some Republicans and some Democrats. I say to my colleagues that if it can be proved that a man who has been appointed as a Republican judge is in fact a Democrat in disguise there is a right of appeal to the courts of the country under the extraordinary writs which all lawyers know exist in every State of the Union, and especially in Missouri.

The commissioners are compelled to comply with that statute. Now what do they do? These clerks go from house to house to verify these lists. When they come to a two-story house with a cellar and 10 rooms and find that 50 men have been registered as residing in that house, or even 30 or 20—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BENTON. I thought I was to have an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied an hour.

Mr. BENTON. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE] promised me some time.

The CHAIRMAN. One hour having been occupied on the Democratic side of the House, the Chair must now recognize some gentleman on the Republican side.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to continue and conclude his speech, the time which he may occupy coming out of my hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to continue and conclude his speech, the time thus occupied to be taken from the time which the gentleman from Tennessee would hereafter have. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. GAINES. Before the gentleman from Missouri resumes, will he allow me to remind him that the game which he was just now describing has been practiced very successfully in the city of Philadelphia, where, according to the exposures of the North American newspaper, 150 men have been found registered at a single dwelling where perhaps not more than 10 or 20 would really reside?

Mr. BENTON. Yes. When these two clerks appointed by the commissioners—one a Republican and the other a Democrat—go around in these election precincts and find that 50 or 60 men have been registered as residents at a house where there are only 18 or 20 living, it is the duty of the clerks to verify the list, and if they find only 18 men living at a house where 50 are registered, it is their sworn duty to give that information to the election registry board and must notify the persons registered; and the board of registration, Republican and Democratic, the Republican clerk and the Democratic clerk, shall purge that list by notifying each

one of the men registered at that particular house to come forward and prove his right to vote, failing to do which he loses that right.

There is another thing which seems to hurt worse than anything else. It has been charged—I do not live in St. Louis; I have not lived there since I was a schoolboy—it has been charged frequently by Populists and Prohibitionists and Democrats that boat loads of negroes were hauled up from New Orleans, Vicksburg, Memphis, Helena, Cairo, Ill., and Columbus, Ky., and dumped out at St. Louis where they were registered as belonging to the Fourth Ward or the Fifth Ward or some other ward of that city, and it was the aim of the people of Missouri to ascertain whether that charge was true or not. I do not know that such charges were true. It was charged by men there—

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri rose.

Mr. BENTON. Wait a minute till I get through with my sentence and I will give you a show. Of course, I do not want to be ungenerous to my colleague. I always yield.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Does the gentleman assume any responsibility himself for that statement?

Mr. BENTON. Do I?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BENTON. I absolutely assume responsibility for the statement I made.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Do you assume responsibility for that imputation that we imported voters from New Orleans to St. Louis?

Mr. BENTON. Did you hear me say anything of that sort?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I heard you make the insinuation.

Mr. BENTON. No; you did not.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I so understood the gentleman.

Mr. BENTON. You misunderstood; you are just out of humor. You heard me say that it was charged by the people of St. Louis, Prohibitionists, Populists, and Democrats, that such was the fact, and that I distinctly said, not having lived there for thirty years, I did not know the truth of it.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Did you mean to create that impression here in this House?

Mr. BENTON. I meant to create the impression that that has been stated, and that that story went to Jefferson City to the legislature, and that the legislature, believing the statements were true, determined to make an election law that would prevent it. That is what I mean.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Are you willing to tell us who made any such statement?

Mr. BENTON. Any particular person?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BENTON. Why, I do not pretend to say. I say very frankly that I believe that the records which I have read show that your vote has grown abnormally, and that, in my opinion, is dishonesty, and that the legislature believed it proved dishonesty and determined to make a law that would permit persons to vote who were entitled and no others.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Does the gentleman not know that while the State of Missouri, outside of the city of St. Louis, was a silver State, the city of St. Louis is a sound-money city?

Mr. BENTON. Well, how does it come, then—

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. That is how it comes.

Mr. BENTON. How does it come, then, that we increased our vote 15,000 over the vote of 1892, which was a big increase, and yet your increase was more than double ours, with a less vote cast previous to that time?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I say that accounts for the large Republican vote there.

Mr. BENTON. Do you pretend to say that the fight as between Valliant and Marshall on one side and the Republican candidates on the other was a contest as between the gold and silver standards?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. But you are speaking of 1896. That was the vote that you read here.

Mr. BENTON. Well, I read the vote of 1898 too. It seems that the gentleman's ears are only open for one statement at a time. I am covering both elections.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. You have been reading from the statistics of 1896.

Mr. BENTON. I read from 1898 too.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. And I say the vote of 1896 and 1898 in the city of St. Louis was owing to the fact, which is well known through this country, that the city of St. Louis is a sound-money city.

Mr. BENTON. Well, great guns, Mr. Chairman, we increased our vote normally. We increased our vote almost 50 per cent.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. And by reason of the fact that the free-silver heresy prevailed outside of the city of St. Louis in the rest of the State of Missouri.

Mr. BENTON. But that does not account for our great increase in St. Louis.

I beg the gentleman's pardon for anything personal, but I was talking of the city vote, where you say sound money caused your big vote. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am willing to confess that some two thousand Democrats in the Twelfth Congressional district, more than came to us from the Republican side, went to the Republican column in 1896, and that that is the cause of the Twelfth district being represented by the gentleman [Mr. PEARCE of Missouri] on this floor, as far as I know. That is the reason I assign for the gentleman's election twice from a Democratic district, but that does not account for your increase of nearly 100 per cent in four years, while the Democrats had a fully normal increase of 30 per cent.

I was not undertaking to say what I knew about the city of St. Louis, but I said to you what the charges were that were made by people in St. Louis. Now, the gentleman knows they came to the legislature in streams. He wants me to individualize. I was not there. I read in the public prints what the charges were, made by Democrats, Populists, and Prohibitionists. I have just read from the election returns of the State and of the city, for twenty years back, to show that the growth of the Republican vote and the Democratic vote had been normal up to 1896; that the growth of the Democratic vote in 1896 was still normal, and even a little in advance of it, and yet the Republican vote had increased from 35,000 to 66,000 in two years, and that, in my opinion, I said, was an abnormal growth, and that in my opinion, following, it was not an honest growth.

Now, it will not do to say that the tremendous Republican vote came from the Democratic party and swelled that vote from 34,800 to 66,000 when at the same time the Democratic vote was increased 15,000 in the same four years. That does not meet the question. I say that is the reason why the Democratic legislators from the mountains, the prairies, and the valleys of Missouri determined to go in and make an election law that would be absolutely pure and straight and clean, and that a man under that new law should live in the State of Missouri twelve months, and should live in the city of St. Louis sixty days, and in the ward or precinct where he desired to vote twenty days. And this very law would help him, because if he wants to move after he has been registered he can go and have his registration changed. If he is not 21 years old at the time of registration, but will be 21 years old on election day, they must register him in the precinct where he lives.

I never was on an election committee from the legislature that went to St. Louis. I never was an attorney in an election case. I do not know. I have read and heard the charges only, but I do say and I challenge the radicals from Missouri to read to this Republican House this Nesbit election law. Read it all. And then if you can honestly damn it, you damn your own performances in the great city of St. Louis. No honest Republican can object to this law, not a word of it. After the election, when the votes have been polled (and every party has a challenger at the polls in St. Louis as well as outside), it is made the duty of one of these judges of election to string these ballots when they are called, they being called by one and strung by another, in the presence of those who watch for us, and when it is over the ballots are put in the box and it is sealed up and the names of the judges of election are written upon it and the boxes are not permitted to be tampered with. If a box is tampered with, it can be seen. Then it is locked up and kept there and not reopened unless on a contest before the courts of the State.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that when any man attacks the present election law of our great State of Missouri or of the city of St. Louis he does it in the face of the fact that he has the right, if he does not believe that law is constitutional, to go before the courts of the State, and there is not a Republican on this floor who would have the hardihood to challenge the supreme court of the State of Missouri as being dishonest. If he does, and the story gets back to Missouri, he would have to prove it or himself be pilloried as a dishonest man.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman if he does not know that there is a case now pending in the supreme court of the State of Missouri to test the constitutionality of the Nesbit law?

Mr. BENTON. Exactly. And it was the duty of your colleague [Mr. BARTHOLOTT] to have sat still and let the great State of Missouri pass upon it, through the supreme court of the State, and not make the Nesbit law an excuse to attack our laws and our people.

If the Nesbit law is unconstitutional, if there is one line of it unconstitutional, you can rest assured that the old Democratic supreme court, one member of whom has been on the bench for nearly thirty years, will give you the benefit of your constitutional rights.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I hope so.

Mr. BENTON. That is an insinuation that is unjust, coming from a gentleman who knows that the supreme court of Missouri has never been attacked for unjust or unconstitutional decisions. I need not defend the supreme court of Missouri. Men may crawl around the feet of our judges as vermin and attack them as they please, but the splendid records of men who have set upon our supreme court bench for thirty years are a part of the history of this great Government, and no small-bore, two-by-four, radical politicians can hurt that great court. [Applause.] The decisions of the supreme court of Missouri are read and cited in the great States of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, with approval, as well as in Georgia, Texas, and Virginia; and the supreme court of Missouri stands as high in rank for legal ability and personal character as any court in America. With that grand old Missourian, Sherwood, at its head, that court is above attack. Our judges are not politicians. The judges of the supreme court are not now to be nominated in a political convention. This is given over to the legal fraternity, and the high character of our supreme court can not be successfully criticised by the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. PEARCE] by any insinuations he may make. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. BENTON. I have no objection to yielding, if I had all day to talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will never have again, while I am a member of this Congress, to defend my State. I hope no man from Missouri will ever have to do it. We were invited by the Representative from the Tenth Missouri district [Mr. BARTHOLOTT], to use his own language, "to raise the curtain" and look at Missouri. I can say to him that a man of more ability and greater brilliancy than he, as the Republican nominee for governor in 1892, presumed to raise the curtain of Missouri since 1865 and invite scrutiny. He had one round of it at Sedalia, and it satisfied him for all time. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I have been driven into this debate. My Republican colleague has the curtain up, and we must see more of it.

Shortly after the war, when 75,000 people of Missouri who had been the owners of the soil—I had high said the aristocracy of the State, but that would have been wrong, because in Missouri we have no aristocracy of the blood; we know of no other aristocracy than that of individual merit and personal accomplishment [applause]—when the best element in the State under the Draconian constitution were not permitted to vote, county courts were organized, not with the votes of the people, but were given whole and complete authority to put their slimy hands into the pockets of the people and burden the resources of our bleeding State, and they fastened a railroad bonded debt on about 35 different counties, many of which never saw a foot of railroad, and yet had bonds of from two hundred thousand to twelve hundred thousand dollars fastened on them.

When the people of the State got control and elected their own county officers, they found bonds piled up on them, made by these midnight caucuses of Republican county officers. They had been sold to innocent parties for a valuable consideration without notice—that usual plea set up by a scoundrel who wants to collect a dishonestly contracted debt. They came to our people and said: "We have got \$400,000 of bonds against your county." They asked that they be paid, and the county officers replied, "Where is the railroad?" "Oh," they said, "we do not know anything about that. You issued the bonds for it." Our people replied, "We can not pay for these bonds; the people did not know that these bonds were being issued; no authority was given for the creation of these bonds; we had not the usual notice of the bonds being issued." There were fifteen or twenty million dollars of these bonds issued.

The bondholders appealed to the Federal courts, and they took the county judges and put them in the jails of Kansas City, Springfield, and St. Jo when they refused to make a levy to pay these fraudulent bonds. There they lay with felons and criminals of every class. They forced the counties to compromise these debts in all but three counties in the State, and in these the judges of the county courts have been for years fugitives, although the unanimous choice of their counties for the judgeships they hold. And in this way the Republican party, in city, township, and county indebtedness, put \$32,000,000 upon the people of the State, when a large number could not vote. The great State of Missouri had just prior to 1860 loaned its credit to five great railroad corporations for \$31,000,000 to help develop the State. When the war was over, not having been able to pay the accumulated interest on these bonds, they rose to \$36,000,000, with interest.

The State was not able to pay them, but we had a first-mortgage lien on every line of railroad in the State, and the appraisers appointed by a Republican governor of the State reported the cash value of the roads on which we had a mortgage at \$37,000,000,

and probably \$45,000,000. Here another dark chapter begins. The Republican party, by its legislature and its governor, then in complete control of the State, by virtue of disfranchisement, sold the liens on these railroads, amounting to \$31,500,000, and on railroads worth not less than \$37,000,000, and probably \$45,000,000, for the pitiful sum of \$6,131,000, when there was no sort of necessity for it.

They collected a large amount of money from other sources. The Government paid them a great deal of money; altogether they collected \$19,582,000, and only \$6,131,000 was from the State's mortgage on the railroad; and with that \$19,000,000 they paid \$14,000,000 of the State debt in four years. Mark you, the first-mortgage lien on these railroads belonged to the sovereign State. We had a right to foreclose our mortgage and get our bonds paid out first, but the Republican party, through its administration of State affairs, sold the lien of the State worth forty millions for the paltry sum of six millions and a fraction, still leaving more than thirty millions of debt; and then by collections from the Federal Government and by enormous taxation that ran as high as 90 cents on the hundred dollars, besides occupation tax and poll tax, they only paid \$14,000,000 in that time.

And when we came into power in 1873 we found fastened on us the enormous debt of \$21,000,000. And what for? Because of the fact that the Republican administration, and legislature behind it, had sold our mortgage liens, which would have paid the debt and had millions left, had sold it for six millions and a fraction, and the people of Missouri had to assume the balance. We were then paying 50 cents on \$100 taxation, and our legislature, under the constitution made in 1875, brought down the tax levy of the State to 20 cents for general purposes and 10 cents for interest, and made it obligatory that when the great State should reach an assessed value of \$900,000,000 the assessment should be 5 cents less. And so it is that while we have reduced the taxation one-half in that time, while we have added to the great school fund of the State \$3,640,000, making the grand total of \$4,393,000, the actual money for which the State issued certificates, I say, after having cut the taxes in half, we have reduced that indebtedness from twenty-one million until, on the 1st of January, 1900, there is the paltry sum of \$2,800,000 of that awful debt left upon us by the Republicans when we came into power.

One more term of Democratic government in Missouri will wipe out the whole State debt. The gentleman [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] refers to the time when the Republicans, good and true men of the State, will come again to their own and be in possession of the State government of Missouri. In view of the fact, my fellow-countrymen, that in the township, city, county, and State debts which these people piled up on us, amounting to \$70,000,000 in the five years in which they controlled the State, his hope will be long deferred. As long as these men live who were not permitted the right of suffrage, who were not permitted to practice law, were not permitted to practice medicine, were not permitted to preach the gospel of Christ, were not permitted to teach school in their neighborhood; as long as the men who have come to America, and their sons after them, the men who have come from the North and who have learned the story from the public prints and from their friends of what the Republicans did when in control, so long will it be impossible for the dream of the gentleman from the Tenth district of Missouri to be realized; so long as we keep our memory there will not be a Republican administration in the great State of Missouri. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The State of Missouri's record for financial integrity is as high as any State in this American Union. Nature has been wonderfully good to us; she has blessed us beyond belief. We were a border State when the war came up. Unfortunately, our people did not think alike on the subject, and 89,000 of them joined hands with their brothers in the South, and 109,000 were loyal to the flag of the Union. It made a bitter and disagreeable state of affairs in that great State. It was a battle ground, a fight between the militia and the guerrillas, to say nothing of the great armies of the contending forces passing across her borders. At last peace came, and at last the people made up their minds that the way to have lasting peace was for every man to be permitted, white or black, Republican or Democrat, whatever his politics might be, to vote at every election, and vote once and only once, and the people of Missouri have with great cheerfulness accepted the results of every election held in the great State of Missouri.

It is wonderful what this great State has done since the people got in possession of their own property and their own elections. She had a fraction over 1,000,000 people thirty years ago. I think I can promise you that the census of 1900 will give us three and a half million people. Thirty years ago, or twenty-seven years ago, when we took control of the State, the assessed valuation of that State was something like \$400,000,000. It has mounted at the rate of one hundred millions every quadrennial period, and to-day, with an assessed valuation at the rate of about 62 cents on the dollar of its real value, we have an assessed valuation of twelve hundred million dollars. We are also superlatively blessed by nature.

The State of Missouri can, perhaps, come nearer making a Chinese wall around herself than any other sovereignty in the Government and live within herself. She has all the great things within the borders of the earth, except gold and silver, that you can get out of the earth.

It has a splendid climate, a magnificent people—with here and there an exception in the shape of a croaker as a member of Congress from St. Louis. [Laughter.] And let me say to you that that great State under Democratic control has prospered in spite of national laws that bore down upon her people and tied the hands of her great industries. The bulk of our industry in the State of Missouri is farming and stock raising; and there has been no legislation in favor of the man who follows the plow and wields the hoe. Yet in spite of that, in spite of adverse legislation, in spite of legislation which has been hurtful to the people of that sovereign State, her growth has been marvelous. We are filling up with people. We have got there the adventurous Yankee from New England, the German, the Englishman, the Irishman, the Frenchman. These people from other localities have settled within our borders, become good citizens, have bought and cultivated our lands; and when Germans have settled themselves there, they have not called themselves "German-Americans." [Laughter.] When they have become naturalized, they regard themselves as American citizens and Missourians.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I may never have to say another word in defense of the State of Missouri. I hope these old, bad memories will be allowed to rest and that men of all parties may live at peace in Missouri. I think her history will speak for her. But while I am not to that State "native and to the manner born," I claim to be as good a Missourian as he who was born there, because after I had attained my majority I chose that State from among all the States of the Union for my permanent home. I have made my home there. I brought there the wife of my bosom. I have buried my dead there. My children were born there; and the time will never come when I shall undertake to foul the nest that for thirty-odd years has given me a home. The State of Missouri will take care of herself; and the attacks of gentlemen here will make no difference. If the Nesbit election law is as vile as gentlemen here say it is, the Supreme Court, if it find one improper line, will cause its repeal.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I hope so.

Mr. BENTON. If that election law is permitted to stand, as I hope it will be, you will have a fair and honest election in St. Louis; and then, in my opinion, the gentleman's prophecy made in the caucus of his party, that no other Republican will darken the doors of this House from Missouri, will be fulfilled. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] has four minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is guilty of the charge which he hurled at me. He said that I was putting up a straw man to knock him down. No word, no syllable has been uttered by me or by my colleague to-day assailing the honor or the integrity of the State of Missouri or her people. No word nor syllable has been spoken here by us to assail the honor or integrity of the supreme court of the State of Missouri—not one word. When it comes to a question of loyalty to the State of Missouri, I say, although my friend characterizes me as a newcomer, having lived in the State but twenty-seven years, I am his peer and certainly second to no Democrat from that State.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid some of the statements which the gentleman has made are misleading. I believe you gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House to be fair, well-meaning men. You are desirous of knowing the facts in relation to the election laws of Missouri. My friend has assuredly mixed up and confounded the law as applied to the State and the law as applied to the city of St. Louis. It is true that the law now in force in rural Missouri is a good law, and that is the very reason why we want its operation continued in the city of St. Louis. If it is a good law, why, then, was it changed and the change to exclusively apply to the city of St. Louis?

If the growth of Republicanism alarms the gentleman, I merely point him to the fact that under the old election laws, which provided for a Democratic register of voters and for none but Democratic or so-called Republican judges and clerks of elections, the Republicans of my city had to cast 20,000 Republican majority before they were credited with 1,000 when the result of the election was announced. After that a fair election law was enacted by a Republican house and a Democratic senate and signed by a Democratic governor, and under that law, for the first time in the history of the city of St. Louis, we received our dues. The votes cast were honestly counted, and the result revealed a tremendous Republican majority. That is just what is nettling our Democratic friends. They put their heads together and said that "that condition must be changed; we will have to make St. Louis Democratic; honestly, if we can, by an unfair election law, if we must."

So they put this law upon the statute books, and, Mr. Chairman, I stand by every word I uttered in denunciation of that infamous piece of legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PUGH. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PEARCE].

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. It has been my habit since I have had the honor of being a member of this House to treat all of my associate members, whether they agree with me in politics or whether they do not, with perfect personal courtesy.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] has gone a long way out of his track to make some personal attacks upon me, for what reason I do not know and care less. A man who resorts to that sort of procedure in the course of debate is certainly weak, if he is not cowardly, and that is all I have to say on that subject.

The gentleman has given us here some history as to the condition of things in the State of Missouri, and he has told us about the constitution of 1865. It is true. I notice that whenever a Republican criticizes or debates the correctness of things in the South our Democratic friends immediately say that we are flaunting the bloody shirt, and I also notice that if there is any mistake or unfortunate condition of things chargeable to the Republican party, at any time in the history of the land, a Democrat never fails to bring it to light at the first opportunity, especially if it grew out of the civil war.

In 1865, gentlemen, we were right after the close of the war. Blood was hot, men were savage, but the constitution of Missouri of 1865 provided one condition only, and that was that a man in order to enjoy the immunities of that State must have been a loyal man. No man was ever subjected to the penalties of that constitution unless he was chargeable with disloyalty.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will my friend allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it not true that Gen. Frank Blair, after fighting for four years in the Union Army and commanding a corps, was refused the privilege of voting under that Drake constitution?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. The cause—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute. Was he not refused the right to vote and did he not sue the judges and bring that case to the Supreme Court of the United States and "bust" the Drake constitution?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Yes; because that constitution provided a test oath, which General Blair refused to take, for the purpose of testing the constitutionality of that provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask another question. I will have the gentleman's time extended. Did not General Blair state, when they wanted him to take that test oath, that he fought four years to put down the rebellion; that he would be willing to fight four years more, but that he could not take that test oath without swearing to a lie, because he did sympathize with his blood relations and his friends who were in the Confederacy, and he would not take it on that ground? Is not that the truth about it, and did not that oath require a man to swear that he not only did not abet the rebellion, but that he did not sympathize with any soul that was in the rebellion?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Well, my good friend is not correct; but I am not defending that constitutional provision. I am simply giving to this House the historical condition of the thing; that is all. I went to the city of St. Louis in 1866, and from that hour to this I have been campaigning upon the skirmish lines of the Republican party. In Democratic territory I have been rotten egged; I have had stones thrown at me; I have been fired at; I have been driven off the stump in Democratic counties in that State, time and time again from 1866 to 1874, by Democratic thugs and Democratic heelers. That was the condition of things that prevailed there; and yet in 1872, despite those facts, I am one of the men who voted to repeal that constitutional inhibition, and to entitle all the voters of our great State to the right of suffrage.

It seems to me that it was foreign to this discussion to lug in the constitution of the State of Missouri of 1865. What in the name of conscience has that to do with the Nesbit election law?

It happens that the city of St. Louis is a city which is living at this time, and has been for twenty years, under a separate charter; and the election law which applies to the counties of the State, and even to the city of Kansas City, does not apply to the city of St. Louis.

Mr. ROBB. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. ROBB. The gentleman asked what certain matters had to do with the Nesbit election law. I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not think the State of Missouri is fully capable of taking care of its own election law?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I suppose so. It has the right, I believe, to take care of its own election laws. I do not see the point of the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBB. Then, as the gentleman does not see the point, I should like to ask him what point is there in this discussion if the State of Missouri is capable of taking care of her own election laws, as we all believe she is?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Possibly before I get through the gentleman may be able to discover the point. I am speaking here in my own time and not by virtue of the sufferance of the gentleman, I believe.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman refers to the Kansas City election law, which I understand the gentleman to heartily indorse. I wish to ask him if his colleague [Mr. BARTHOLOMT] did not condemn that law in the same terms in which he condemned the St. Louis law?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I am not responsible for the utterances of my friends.

Mr. COWHERD. I will ask the gentleman if the Republican party did not condemn it when it was passed?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I am responsible only for what I say; and I say, with a full knowledge of the responsibility which I have in saying it, after a careful study of the Nesbit election law, that it is the most disgraceful piece of election legislation that was ever written upon a statute book—worse in its administrative features than the law enacted in Kentucky and known as the Goebel law. Here is an election law that provides that the governor of the State of Missouri shall appoint an election board. It then vests in that election board the absolute power—without the power of review by the courts of our State—the absolute power to institute and control all the machinery of politics in the city of St. Louis, and that law was passed and made applicable to St. Louis, not in specific terms, but made applicable to cities of 300,000 population. And as there is but one such city in the State of Missouri, it was therefore designed and enacted for the purpose of stealing the city of St. Louis from the Republican party by whatsoever means were appropriate to that nefarious undertaking, and the courts have no power of review. The gentleman talks about the growth of parties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the gentleman ought to have five minutes more. I took up some of his time.

Mr. CANNON. If I can be recognized in my own time, I should be glad to yield some time to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized more gentlemen than will occupy all the time that has been assigned, provided each gentleman demands the balance of his hour. The Chair will of course recognize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], but the Chair desired to make that statement so that there might be no misunderstanding to-morrow when gentlemen who have been recognized can not obtain a full hour's time.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair include my name among those recognized for to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly not. The gentleman has not yet been recognized. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PEARCE].

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. My colleague from Missouri [Mr. BENTON], from what motive I do not know, undertook to put into my mouth an innuendo against the supreme court of my State.

He knows that he had no justification for that statement. I made no attack, I made no intimation of any kind that would reflect upon the supreme court of Missouri, which court I respect and honor, and before which I have practiced for nearly thirty years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that while his colleague was talking, and was saying that the supreme court of Missouri would certainly give justice in considering this law, that the gentleman said with what seemed to me to be an ironical tone of voice, "I hope so?"

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I did not use the word "justice."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. When the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENTON] was saying that the supreme court would consider that law and do justice, did not you say in a sotto voce tone of voice, "I hope so?" And was not that the occasion of the gentleman going off and saying that you had made an insinuation?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Some gentlemen here thought you did.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. That was on the suggestion of the

gentleman from Missouri. I said there was a case in the supreme court of Missouri between the parties contesting the constitutionality of the law, and he expressed the opinion, as I got the idea, that you can get justice. I supposed his reference was that we would get the case, and I said I hoped so. I supposed that was what he meant, and that is what I meant.

The State of Missouri is one of the imperial States of this Union. I have lived in it longer than the gentleman himself has, because I went there in 1866; and in my humble way I have tried to build up her glory and her prosperities. I have tried early and late, year in and year out, to build up those prosperities upon the only line upon which, in my judgment, they could have been built up, and that is on the line of the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is that party that has given that State her prosperities in the development of her mines of zinc and lead, in her great forests of timber, in constructional stone, and in everything, indeed, of importance.

The prosperity in her cereals, too, has been developed, in my humble opinion, by the policy of the Republican party, and therefore I have advocated it. He cites you to the growth of the Republican party in Missouri. Yes; it has grown from small beginnings in 1866 to an imperial vote of 305,000; and if the percentage of growth of the Republican party, as compared with the Democratic party, holds for the next five years as it has for the last ten, then the prediction of my colleague from St. Louis will be verified and a Republican governor and a Republican legislature will control the destinies of that State. My friend speaks of the vote in 1866.

Mr. ROBB. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. ROBB. Suppose you had a Republican governor in the State of Missouri, do you think that you and your colleague would be so hostile to this Nesbit election law that you now condemn and criticize so severely?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. The first thing a Republican legislature would do would be to repeal the infamous statute and give the Democrats a full chance at the polls. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the policy of the Republican party. It is insinuated by the gentleman in his accusation that New Orleans negroes were imported into Missouri. I challenge the statement made by him or any other man, and I denounce it as absolutely false. I know as much about the elections of the city of St. Louis as any other man in this House; and I tell you that never in the history of that State, whether under Democratic or Republican régimes, has there ever been any such importation as the accusation intimates.

The reason for the large growth of the Republican party vote in 1896 and in 1898 was because of the fact that the city of St. Louis, with a normal Republican majority of 15,000, increased her vote largely because it was known to be and is in fact a sound-money center. The great mass of her people believe in a sound-money policy. When I was nominated for Congress in 1896 I told my Congressional committee that if I ran for Congress in 1896, I did not propose to split any hairs upon the money question. I fought that campaign, gentlemen, upon the gold standard, in workshops, among the rich men, among the poor, and I carried that Democratic district, which had been Democratic ever since 1890, by nearly 4,000 majority, and would have carried it by over 5,500 majority if I had not been swindled out of 1,500 by the Democratic management. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I never found any difficulty in arguing Republican principles in the city of St. Louis, and I never found any difficulty about arguing them in the State of Missouri, except as I have had to face Democratic rotten eggs, Democratic brickbats, and Democratic bullets.

Mr. ROBB. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. ROBB. I want to suggest that I think the gentleman ought to have had the other fifteen hundred for being an exception to the rule—the fact that he was honest and came out in favor of the gold standard.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I have no pretenses to make. If I do not represent properly the sentiment of the majority of the people who live in my Congressional district, I do not want to be in the House of Representatives—I have no business here—and if I thought at this hour that I did not correctly represent their sentiment on this floor, I would resign my place to-morrow morning. There is something else in the membership of this House besides the mere dignity of being here, the benefits of being here. We are here holding in our hands a sacred trust, and no man of honor would sit here an hour unless he thought he was a representative of the majority sentiment of the district in which he lived.

And so in 1898 in the State of Missouri, as is known to a great many people at least, the silver sentiment, so called, prevailed throughout the whole State. Even such counties as Jasper and Greene, counties which were heretofore Republican, went hell bent for the silver heresy; and these facts account for the large in-

crease in the Democratic vote in the State of Missouri and of the Republican vote of the city of St. Louis.

Now, as my colleague has said, if the election laws of the State as applied to Kansas City, St. Joseph, and other communities in the State—if those are such rightful, proper election laws, I ask this House why, in the name of God, was it necessary to pass a special election law and vest this whole election machinery, the registration, the polls, and the returns, in a Democratic board of commissioners from whose decision there is no appeal under the law?

Now, we are not frightened. I do not agree with my colleague from the city of St. Louis about the results of this law. I have had to face Democratic legislation before that I did not like. I have never hesitated to fight it. I will fight this law on the hustings, in the courts, at the polls, everywhere and at all times, because it is an unrighteous, impolitic, unfair, un-American device to prostitute the sacred privilege of the ballot box to the nefarious ends of a political party, the results of which you have seen in the occurrences of a sister State only a fortnight ago. Shall we have more of it? Has the time come when our ambitions for party success are so great that we must needs be unfair and dishonest in our relations to our fellow-men? If that be so, gentlemen, then I give you warning that you will live to see the day when you will bitterly regret it. It does not scare anybody. The city of St. Louis is a Republican city by 15,000 majority, and she will remain so despite all your election machinery, backed up by 400 new Democratic policemen put into office for the purpose of giving force and effect to a nefarious election law.

Mr. COWHERD. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I want to ask him a question. Is not the Republican election commissioner in St. Louis, appointed by the governor, one of the most reputable citizens of that city and a lifelong Republican?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I do not know; I was not there when the appointment was made.

Mr. COWHERD. Well, the gentleman knows by the press.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. No; I do not. Who is he?

Mr. COWHERD. He is one of the best known manufacturers there, Mr. Cobush.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I am not acquainted with him. I have been absent from St. Louis for some time. I simply say this, if my colleague will permit me, that an appointment of an opposite party official is not, in my judgment at least, a safe trust to vest in the hands of another party man. Heretofore under the old election law the governor appointed two of the election commissioners, and the mayor of the city of St. Louis appointed the third. Why was it changed? They had the majority then. It was changed simply for the purpose of enabling the governor of the State to put into that board somebody who would answer his purpose rather than somebody who would not. I do not mean that remark to apply to this appointee. I do not know the gentleman who has been appointed, as I have been absent from St. Louis a long time, but I am speaking of the possibilities of the law. The thing is wrong on its face and a fraud in its intent.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PAYNE, having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8347) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2356. An act extending the powers and functions of the Court of Private Land Claims to June 30, 1902—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

S. 79. An act to construct a road to the national cemetery at Dover, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. R. 36. Joint resolution to carry into effect two resolutions of the Continental Congress directing monuments to be erected to the memory of Generals Francis Nash and William Lee Davidson, of North Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

S. 1356. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Field—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2366. An act to authorize the establishment at some point in North Carolina of a station for the investigation of problems connected with marine fishery interests of the middle and south Atlantic coast—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1535. An act to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Navy and to regulate promotion therein—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1632. An act to amend "An act authorizing certain officers of

the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths," approved January 25, 1895—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2447. An act to place Lieut. Col. and Bvt. Maj. Gen. Alexander Stewart Webb on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 726. An act for the relief of Alice Walsh—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2334. An act to authorize Hon. Arthur S. Hardy, at present envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, to accept the decoration tendered to him by the Shah of Persia while he was minister of the United States to that country—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2022. An act to authorize Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson, United States Navy; Capt. Henry C. Taylor, United States Navy; Capt. Francis A. Cook, United States Navy; Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, United States Navy; Capt. French E. Chadwick, United States Navy; Capt. Caspar F. Goodrich, United States Navy; Commander William W. Mead, United States Navy; Commander James H. Dayton, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Symonds, United States Navy, and Commander Chapman C. Todd, United States Navy, to accept orders and decorations tendered to them by the Government of Venezuela—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harriet D. Newson—to the Committee on Claims.

S. R. 60. Joint resolution granting permission for the erection of a bronze statue in Washington, D. C., in honor of Gen. Francis E. Spinner, late Treasurer of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

S. 2681. An act for the establishment of joint light-houses and fog-signal station on the coast of Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1289. An act to provide for the construction of an additional light-ship for use on the coast of California, Oregon, Washington, or Alaska, as exigencies may determine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 983. An act for the relief of Lindley C. Kent and Joseph Jenkins as the sureties of Frank A. Webb—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 165. An act for the relief of Robert J. Spottswood and the heirs of William C. McClellan, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 945. An act for the purchase and construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Astoria, Oreg.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 557. An act for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

S. 76. An act for the relief of the University of Kansas—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1749. An act for the payment to Joshua T. Roberts of balance due for surveying public lands—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 188. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2940. An act for enlarging the public building at Portland, Oreg., situated between Morrison, Yamhill, Fifth, and Sixth streets, in said city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Senate concurrent resolution 26:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made, and submit a report and an estimate for deepening and properly improving the channel through the outer bar in the Gulf of Mexico near the mouth of Mobile Bay—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3718. An act for the preservation of the frigate *Constitution*.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. R. 83. Joint resolution increasing the limit of cost of the new building for the Government Printing Office, to meet the increased prices of building materials, and to permit of making the south end of the power-house extension of the same height as the main building.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to reserve all points of order on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama reserves all points of order. The bill, with the accompanying

report, will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

And then, on motion of Mr. HEMENWAY (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue relating to readjustment of salaries of collectors of internal revenue throughout the country—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an additional appropriation for clerks in the office of the Auditor for the Interior Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the California Débris Commission—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for military roads and bridges in Alaska—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate for the Signal Service of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5056) to authorize the Carolina Northern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River in or near the town of Lumberton, Robeson County, N. C., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 328); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7945) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across Rainy Lake River," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 329); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4006) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 330); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7946) to authorize Frank Hitch to construct and maintain a bridge across Fishing Creek within the boundary lines of Edgecombe County, N. C., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 331); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TATE, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 65) relative to printing of contested-election cases hearings in long primer type, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 332); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5030) to create an executive department of mines and mining, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 334); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House as follows:

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 3043, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R.

8487) for the relief of Col. Charles B. Dougherty and other members of the Ninth Regiment of Pennsylvania Infantry, accompanied by a report (No. 313); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred House bill 7801, for the relief of John D. Youell, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 144), accompanied by a report (No. 316); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. COCHRANE of New York, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Capt. George W. Weeden, of Olneyville, R. I., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 317); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca P. Quint, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 318); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 470) granting a pension to Jane Dykes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 319); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5346) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Norris, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 320); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 206) to pension Isaac D. Smith, Company A, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 321); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gangloff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 322); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3966) granting an increase of pension to David Talmon, of Wymore, county of Gage, Nebr., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 323); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to William G. McLain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 324); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7622) granting a pension to Peter M. Heaton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 325); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 917) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Campbell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 326); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4177) to correct the military record of William Elbert, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 333); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. SPALDING, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4324) for the relief of George W. Croft and others, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 314); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4323) for the relief of Eugenia A. Stone, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 315); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill

(H. R. 8487) for the relief of Col. Charles B. Dougherty and other members of the Ninth Regiment of Pennsylvania Infantry—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. WEEKS (by request): A bill (H. R. 8488) to regulate wages for labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8489) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Vincennes, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 8490) to reduce revenue, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 8491) to amend section 2148 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8492) to incorporate the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 8493) for the appointment of an additional United States commissioner in the northern judicial district of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 8494) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8495) for the relief of the acting (volunteer) officers of the United States Navy in the civil war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8496) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Francisco, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8497) to protect State anti-gambling laws from nullification through interstate gambling by telegraph, telephone, or otherwise—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8498) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 8, 1898—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAINES: A bill (H. R. 8499) to equalize the pension laws—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 8500) providing for the execution of new bonds and release of sureties—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8501) making an appropriation for maintenance of the improvements of Trent River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8502) making an appropriation for works of improvement and maintenance of improvement of New River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) making an appropriation for the maintenance of improvement of Northeast (Cape Fear) River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8504) making an appropriation for maintenance of improvement of Black River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8505) making an appropriation for works of improvement and maintenance of improvement of the Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8506) making an appropriation for works of improvement and maintenance of improvement of Neuse River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 8507) to segregate the funds of the Iowa and Sac and Fox of Missouri Indians located in Kansas and Nebraska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 8565) making an appropriation for the construction of a breakwater in Sag Harbor, Suffolk County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8566) authorizing certain suits in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8567) to constitute South Manchester, Conn., a port of delivery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. ESCH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) directing the Secretary of War to submit estimates of amount of damages, if any, to steamboat interests on Upper Mississippi River, if branch of said river known as West Channel, opposite city of La Crosse,

Wis., be declared unnavigable—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A resolution (H. Res. 148) to appoint a messenger in the press gallery of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 8508) to remove charge of desertion from record of Benjamin T. Buford, Company H, Third Kentucky Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 8509) to amend the military record of Lieut. Alonzo Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 8510) granting a pension to Thomas R. Trent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8511) granting a pension to Madison Grimsby—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8512) granting an increase of pension to Capt. John C. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 8513) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Ransom Piper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8514) for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 8515) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stansel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 8516) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Sweetland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting an increase of pension to Harry Planter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8518) granting an increase of pension to T. E. De Pui—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8519) for the relief of John H. Davison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8520) granting a pension to Mary Ann Brenner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMP: A bill (H. R. 8521) amending the military record of Albert E. Pringle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8522) for the relief of Albert F. Wakefield—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8523) for the relief of Esther Pringle, dependent mother of Albert E. Pringle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 8524) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles C. Eddy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 8525) to increase the pension of Maurice Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 8526) granting back pension to Isaac Lantz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 8527) granting a pension to Simeon Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8528) granting a pension to Elizabeth Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8529) granting a pension to Elias Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8530) granting a pension to Thomas Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 8531) to correct the military record of Joseph G. Best, alias Albert E. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 8532) to quitclaim all interest of the United States of America in and to lot 4, square 1113, in the city of Washington, D. C., to William H. Dix—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8533) granting a pension to Thomas O'Toole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 8534) granting a pension to John R. Latson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8535) granting an increase of pension to Andrew E. Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8536) granting an increase of pension to Robert Anderson, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8537) granting a pension to Mary Ann Merrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 8538) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Cameron, alias Samuel C. Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8539) for the relief of John Patterson, of Pottawattamie County, Iowa—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8540) granting a pension to Lydia J. De Silva—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD (by request): A bill (H. R. 8541) for the relief of the heirs of C. C. Spaulding, deceased, late of St. Mary County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8542) granting a pension to James W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGH: A bill (H. R. 8543) for the relief of Mary Lock, of Ashland, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANSELL: A bill (H. R. 8544) for the relief of the estate of Henrietta Bauers, deceased, late of Madison Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 8545) for the relief of T. A. Woodress, of Grundy County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 8546) for the relief of Mrs. S. A. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8547) granting increase of pension to John Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 8548) granting an increase of pension to Horatio P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 8549) to pension Clarissa L. Mills—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8550) to pension Frances P. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8551) to increase the pension of Frances J. Houghton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 8552) to remove the charge of desertion against Conrad Schindler, late of Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and authorize his honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8553) to remove the charge of desertion against Rudolph C. Blancke, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteers, and authorize his honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 8554) for the relief of Morgan C. Gordon, of Camden County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8555) for the relief of Sylvester Dibble, of Beaufort County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8556) for the relief of the creditors of the Deposit Savings Association, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8557) for the relief of the Medical College of Alabama—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina (by request): A bill (H. R. 8558) for the relief of P. H. Boisseau, administrator of Thomas B. Doe, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8559) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Margaret R. Clune—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 8560) granting an increase of pension to Mary Goodrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8561) granting an increase of pension to Jenetta Dunlap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8562) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Appleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 8563) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kiichli—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8564) for the relief of Oren M. Fletcher, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 8568) granting a pension to Charles H. Lipp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8569) for the relief of the heirs of William Dufour—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8570) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Westbrook, of St. Edward, in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 8571) to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of George Maurer, alias Albert Fulton, Company G, Fourth Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8572) to correct the military record of David K. Selzer, a member of Company D, of the Ninety-third Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers, of Wellsville, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8573) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Armstrong—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8574) granting a pension to Mildred McCorkle—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8575) granting a pension to Samuel A. Lownsbury—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8576) granting an increase of pension to Hiram M. Squires—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8577) granting a pension to Levi C. Hare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8578) granting a pension to Samuel J. Woodward, late a member of Company K, Forty-ninth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8579) granting a pension to George C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8580) granting a pension to William Y. Clinton, a member of Company E, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 8581) for the relief of David Bolling—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 8583) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frank Van Valkenberg, alias Charles Duane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'GRADY: A bill (H. R. 8584) granting pensions to Adeline Benjamin and Jane C. Benjamin, the aged and helpless sisters of Col. William Henry Benjamin, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolution of the Fireman's Association of the State of Pennsylvania, in opposition to the passage of Senate bill No. 1743, establishing a division for the regulation of insurance among the several States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6623, to grant a pension to Sarah E. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: Resolutions of the mayors and councils of Eastman, Cochran, and Fitzgerald, Ga., indorsing the work of C. P. Goodyear on the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., and urging such legislation as will enable him to continue the work—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: Petition of the Texas Viavi Company, of Dallas, Tex., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of Auburn Rolling Milling Company, of Auburn, Ill., and others, in favor of certain amendments to the interstate commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6865, for the relief of Jacob A. Henry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Resolutions of the South Carolina Railroad Commission, of Columbia, S. C., favoring amendments to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the city council of Georgetown, S. C., asking for an appropriation for the improvement of Winyah Bay and tributary rivers—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the city council of Georgetown, S. C., asking for an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in Georgetown—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FARIS: Petition of William J. Shepherd and other clerks of Terre Haute (Ind.) post-office, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petitions of James W. Brady, W. H. Leonard, S. A. Kelly, and other post-office clerks of Boston, Mass., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of the Commercial Club of Minneapolis, Minn., urging the establishment of a national park in northern Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Coopers' Union No. 62, of Minneapolis, Minn., against the passage of House bill amending the revenue law making a quarter barrel of beer the smallest package of beer that can be stamped—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of the South St. Paul (Minn.) Live Stock Exchange, against increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Garret Fenenga and 130 other citizens of Douglas and Charles Mix counties, S. Dak., expressing sympathy for the Boer Republic in its present war—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of Charles M. Dorsey and other clerks of Sidney, Ohio, post-office, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the Firemen's Association of the State of Pennsylvania, in opposition to Senate bill No. 1743, for the establishment of a division in the Treasury Department

for the regulation of insurance among the several States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the Braid Manufacturers' Association of New York, H. N. Schloss, president, protesting against the ratification of the reciprocity treaty with France—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of D. W. Hazelton and other citizens of Springfield, Vt., urging the passage of House bill No. 1144, relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McALEER: Resolution of the Firemen's Association of the State of Pennsylvania, opposing the passage of Senate bill No. 1743, establishing a division for the regulation of insurance among the several States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Petition of Post 49, Grand Army of the Republic, of Newburyport, Mass., in support of the House bill No. 4742, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military education in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Petition of Royal E. Blake and other railway postal clerks in the State of Massachusetts, favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Petition of John Rowland and other clerks of Tiffin (Ohio) post-office, in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Fruit Ridge Horticultural Society, of Clyde, Ohio, favoring the passage of the Groat oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati, Ohio, and petition of the National Machinery Company, of Tiffin, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of Cigar Makers' Union No. 79, of Sandusky, Ohio, against the passage of bill admitting products of Puerto Rico free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of Adeline Benjamin and others, to accompany House bill granting a pension to the sisters of the late Brig. Gen. William Henry Benjamin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Resolutions of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Board of Trade, modifying the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. H. Gottschall, druggist, of Harrisburg, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Resolutions of the Carpenters' Union of Elwood, Ind., in relation to the reclamation and settlement of public land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the South St. Paul Live Stock Exchange, against the passage of the Tawney oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Lucius O. Brown, of Medina County, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, asking for relief for those who served in the State militia during the late civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., urging the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of N. Gruber and others, of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the passage of the bill eliminating one-eighth barrels of beer from being stamped by Internal-Revenue Department—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of Wisconsin, against excessive taxation on butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Cigar Makers' Union of Marinette, Wis., against the ceding of public lands to States and Territories—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Retail Clerks' National Protective Association of Ashland, Wis., in favor of the reclamation of the arid lands of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Seamen's Union of the Great Lakes, in opposition to bill No. 5067, pertaining to the boarding of vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THROPP: Papers to accompany House bill No. 4887, to correct the military record of David R. Ellis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petitions of numerous citizens of the counties of Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, and Allegany, N. Y., for a

law subjecting food and dairy products to the laws of the State or Territory into which they are imported—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolutions of Board of Trade, common council, and the Lumberman's Association, all of North Tonawanda, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 2994, authorizing the construction of a dam at the head of the Niagara River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Joseph Schaubert and other druggists, of Mount Clemens, Mich., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill relating to the regulation of wages for labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the citizenship of Choctaw Indians in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolutions of Susquehanna County, Pa., Medical Society, favoring legislation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to scientifically investigate and classify native drug plants—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition and papers of the Armour Packing Company, in relation to the tax on oleomargarine and butterine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter of the secretary of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, in relation to the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Kansas City, Mo., Live Stock Exchange, against increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. K. Mulford Company and the Allison Manufacturing Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Joseph J. Meany & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the ratification of the reciprocity treaty with France—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Boston Merchants' Association, Boston, Mass., for competing cable facilities between the United States and Cuba, etc.—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, letter of M. B. Mahnrin, of Indianapolis, Ind., in relation to monetary and banking systems, rates of interest, and taxes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 15, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. NELSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a report of the Auditor for the War Department relative to the account between the United States and the State of South Carolina growing out of the claim for moneys expended by that State for military purposes in the Florida war of 1836 and 1837; which, on motion of Mr. TILLMAN, was, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d ultimo, a report of the Gettysburg National Park Commission relative to the acquisition of lands in the vicinity of Gettysburg not exceeding in area the parcels of land shown on the map prepared by Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, now on file in the office of the Secretary of War, which were occupied by the infantry, cavalry, and artillery on the 1st, 2d, and 3d days of July, 1863, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota State Veterinary

Medical Association, praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented memorials of Local Union No. 74, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Poughkeepsie, of Local Union No. 311, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Auburn, and of Local Union No. 81, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Peekskill, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the admission of cigars free of duty from the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Cuba, or any other territory; which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 74, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and a petition of Local Union No. 57, Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Brass Workers, of Elmira, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of daily service of laborers, etc., upon public works or works done for the United States, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of D. M. Osborne & Co., of Auburn; Wadsworth's Sons, of Auburn; the Wegman Piano Company, of Auburn; H. A. Mayer, of Syracuse; the Frontenac Manufacturing Company, of Syracuse; Meyer & Co., of Thompsonville; the Merritt Manufacturing Company, of Lockport; Miller & Van Winkle, of Brooklyn; the National Lead Company, of New York City; Richardson & Boynton, of New York City; the Vose & Cliff Manufacturing Company, of New York City; Masury & Son, of New York City; the Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Company, of New York City; C. H. Childs & Co., of Utica; F. Linke & Co., of New York City; the Standard Harrow Company, of Utica, and the Savage Arms Company, of Utica, all in the State of New York, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new fireproof Patent Office building; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Terre Haute, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Thomas H. Boyd & Co., and sundry other druggists of Laporte, Ind., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Dodge Manufacturing Company, of Mishawaka, Ind., and a petition of M. Rumely & Co., of Laporte, Ind., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a new fireproof Patent Office building; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SIMON. I present a petition of the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, of Astoria, Oreg., praying that all the remaining public lands of the United States be held for the benefit of the whole people and that no grants of the title to any of these lands be made to any but actual settlers and home builders on the land. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIA, OREG., February 7, 1900.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas one-third of the entire area of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, is comprised within the domain and still belongs to the people; and Whereas the reclamation and settlement of this vast territory would give employment and a chance to get a home on the land to a multitude of American workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, First, that all the remaining public lands of the United States should be sacredly held for the benefit of the whole people, and that no grants of the title to any of these lands should ever hereafter be made to any but actual settlers and home builders on the land;

Second, that the public grazing lands should be leased in limited areas to settlers on adjacent lands, title to remain in the Federal Government until actual settlement, and the revenues from rentals to go to the States to be used for the reclamation of the irrigable arid lands;

Third, that the Federal Government should build storage reservoirs to save the flood waters that now are wasted, and should wherever necessary build the irrigation works required for the reclamation and settlement of the arid public lands; and

Whereas the foregoing policy is advocated by the National Irrigation Association, as embodied in its constitution, and the object of said association is to bring about its adoption by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Further resolved, That we believe it would be enormously beneficial to the interests of labor that said policy should be adopted, and that all labor organizations should cooperate with the National Irrigation Association to accomplish this result.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the directors of the Latin-American Club and Foreign Trade Association, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable competing cable companies to lay and operate submarine cables from the United States to Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the Missouri State Militia, praying that they be granted pensions the same as